

GN
400
H63
v.3 Littell -
A history of the
Intel growth of
kind in ancient
times.

Southern Branch
of the
University of California
Los Angeles

GN
400
H63
v.3

✓
JS
WILDE NORMAL SCHOOL

✓ T

✓ J

✓ J



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

A HISTORY
OF THE
MENTAL GROWTH OF MANKIND
IN
ANCIENT TIMES

BY
JOHN S. HITTELL

VOLUME III.

JUDEA AND GREECE



NEW YORK
HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY
1893
39488

COPYRIGHT, 1893,
BY
JOHN S. HITTELL.

GN

40

H 63

v. 3

V. 3. 1910
V. 3. 1910
4 v. / 1. 95

CONTENTS OF VOLUME III.

CHAPTER XX. THE ANCIENT JEWS.

SECTION.	PAGE.
305. Palestine.....	7
306. The Jewish Bible.....	9
307. Myth and Legend.....	10
308. Oscillating Piety.....	12
309. The Seesaw Fiction.....	14
310. The Hebrew Monarchy.....	15
311. Religious Condition.....	17
312. The Prophets.....	19
313. The Jewish Monarchy.....	20
314. The Temple, etc.....	21
315. Hilkiah's Book.....	25
316. The Captivity.....	28
317. Synagogue.....	29
318. Predictions.....	31
319. The Return.....	33
320. Three Periods.....	38
321. Prophets.....	41
322. Levite Priests.....	44
323. Aaronite Priests.....	45
324. The High Priest.....	47
325. The Secession.....	49
326. Micah.....	50
327. Many Altars.....	51
328. An Exclusive Sanctuary.....	52
329. Slaughter.....	54
330. Sacrifices.....	56
331. Sacrifice Denounced.....	58
332. Festivals.....	60
333. Sabbatical Years.....	63
334. Sacerdotal Revenue	64

SECTION.	PAGE.
335. Law School, etc.....	65
336. The Divine Name.....	68
337. No Monotheism.....	71
338. Henotheism.....	73
339. Anthropomorphism.....	75
340. No Immortality.....	76
341. Jewish Morality.....	80
342. Woman's Wrongs.....	83
343. Slavery.....	84
344. Hatred of Aliens.....	85
345. Criminal Law.....	87
346. Ecclesiastical Crimes.....	89
347. Malignant Prophets.....	90
348. Originality.....	91
349. Historical Inaccuracy.....	94
350. Mosaic Authorship.....	96
351. A Natural Product.....	98

CHAPTER XXI. EARLY GREECE.

352. Hellas.....	100
353. The Hellens.....	102
354. Superior Polity.....	105
355. Sacred Monarchy.....	107
356. Greek Aristocracy.....	109
357. Constitutionalism.....	111
358. Small States.....	114
359. Military Service.....	117
360. Thorough Drill.....	119
361. Lycurgus.....	123
362. Spartan Army.....	126
363. Spartan Government.....	133
364. Helots.....	136
365. Spartan Policy.....	138
366. Greek Despots.....	143

CHAPTER XXII. ATHENS.

367. Theseus and Draco.....	147
368. Solon.....	15 ¹
369. Athenian Assembly.....	153
370. Citizenship Dignified.....	155

SECTION.	PAGE.
371. First Jury.....	158
372. First Democracy.....	163
373. Pisistratus.....	164
374. Cleisthenes.....	168
375. Isagoras.....	177
376. Persian War.....	180
377. Plataea.....	187
378. Aristides.....	191
379. Pericles.....	196
380. Political Education.....	202
381. Direct Democracy.....	209
382. Athenian Law Courts.....	213
383. Drill and Sway.....	218
384. Peloponnesian War.....	223

CHAPTER XXIII. THEBES, MACEDON, ETC.

385. Epaminondas.....	231
386. Timoleon.....	234
387. Philip.....	242
388. Alexander.....	247
389. The Achæan League.....	251
390. Aratos.....	256
391. Boeotia, etc.....	262

CHAPTER XXIV. GREEK RELIGION.

392. Poetical Myths.....	265
393. Greek Worship.....	271
394. Greek Monotheism.....	275
395. Delphi.....	279
396. Various Responses.....	284
397. Greek Burials, etc.....	293

CHAPTER XXV. LITERATURE AND ART.

398. Homer.....	295
399. The Greek Drama.....	299
400. Socrates.....	302
401. Socratic Philosophy.....	308
402. Plato.....	312
403. Aristotle.....	314
404. Epicurus.....	319

SECTION.	PAGE.
405. Stoicism.....	326
406. Greek Science.....	331
407. Greek Medicine, etc.....	334
408. Greek Music.....	337
409. Greek Architecture, etc.....	338

CHAPTER XXVI. GREEK INDUSTRY.

410. Greek Homes.....	341
411. Greek Agriculture.....	345
412. Greek Commerce.....	347

CHAPTER XXVII. GREEK SOCIETY.

413. Greek Women.....	350
414. Greek Children.....	357
415. Greek Meals, etc.....	358
416. Athletic Games.....	362
417. Greek Morality.....	372
418. Oration of Pericles.....	375
419. Athenian Enjoyment.....	380
420. End of Ancient Greece.....	381
APPENDIX.....	386
Notes.....	386
List of Authorities.....	396

A HISTORY OF MANKIND.

Judea and Greece.

CHAPTER XX.

THE ANCIENT JEWS.

SECTION 305. *Palestine*.—Palestine, the country occupied by the ancient Hebrews, is about one hundred and forty miles long, between the thirty-first and thirty-third degrees of latitude, and forty-five miles wide. For nearly two-thirds of its length it fronts on the Mediterranean, but has no good harbor. Most of its area is mountainous, and better fitted for pasturage than tillage. The rainfall, limited to the winter and spring, is sufficient, if collected in reservoirs and distributed by ditches, to supply all the plain and much of the low hill land with abundant irrigation. The climate is subtropical. Among the chief agricultural products are olives, grapes, dates, wheat, and barley. The only river of note, the Jordan, empties into the Dead Sea, the surface of which is thirteen hundred feet below the level of the ocean. Palestine is not on the line of any great route of traffic by land; it has never had a great commerce, a large city, or great political power. Under a good government it

might support 2,000,000 inhabitants, but probably never had so many.¹

The ancient Hebrews did not excel in any useful or ornamental art. They were not eminent in agriculture, mining, mechanics, navigation, or traffic. The commercial talents, which distinguish their modern descendants, were not yet developed among them. They were not noted as spinners, weavers, dyers, potters, or ship builders. They founded no school of painting, sculpture, or architecture. When they built their temple, they sent to Tyre for workmen. Neither in their social nor political institutions were they original. They contributed nothing to the cause of freedom. They never had a great statesman or orator. They did not originate any new military drill, or copy an old one with much success. They never had a well-disciplined regiment or a famous general. No brilliant campaign or great victory gives luster to their annals. Most of such military strength as they had, lay in their mountainous country and strong national feeling.

The only important feature of their culture is their religious system, including its Bible, priesthood, temple, synagogue, creed, and ceremonial. Its sacred Scripture is especially prominent. Of all national literatures, that of the ancient Jews is the most ecclesiastical. All their books written before Alexander the Great and preserved to our time were accepted by them or their descendants as divinely inspired. Their proverbs, their love songs, their essays on the philosophy of life in the books of Job and Ecclesiastes, their history and their mythology, are all held out to us as of supernatural origin, wisdom, and authority. The ancient Egyptians, Babylonians, Chinese, and Hindoos, as well as later nations, also had

their gospels, but these, in each case, were only a small part of the national literature.

SEC. 306. *The Jewish Bible*.—With numerous faults, the Jewish Bible is a wonderful book. Even those persons who can see nothing sacred in it, and who perceive its many serious defects, must acknowledge that, in many points, it is the greatest of books. It connects historical times with creation. It gives interesting accounts of important events in the early life of the human race. It replies to the questions how, when, where, and by whom government and religion, agriculture and mechanics, vice and sorrow, were introduced into the world. It is the gospel of all civilized and of many barbarous nations. It is accepted by Mohammedans and Christians as well as by Jews. It is the foundation of Christianity. It has been written, printed, translated, read and studied more, and, directly and indirectly, it has exercised more influence, on the fate of nations and on the happiness of individuals, than any other book.

The orthodox theory of the authorship and date of the Jewish Scriptures is that the books were written near the times of which they treat; that Moses, who lived before 1300 b. c., wrote the first five books; that Joshua, Samuel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel were the authors of the books which bear their names; that Solomon wrote Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, and the Song of Songs; that David composed most of the Psalms; and that all the books were written by holy men under the guidance of divine inspiration, with supernatural knowledge and truth, and have been preserved to our time, without material change, as necessary to the establishment and maintenance of the only true system of religion and morality.

Opposed to this orthodox theory is the critical theory, which is now accepted by biblical scholars of the highest authority for learning and judgment. According to this view, the Jewish Bible is the product not of a supernatural revelation but of natural evolution. The fundamental books, the first six in the collection, instead of having been written before 1300 b. c., were composed in subsequent centuries and were first arranged and published in their present shape after 550 b. c. The books of Samuel and Kings were compiled at an earlier date, with the aid of original national traditions and records, and were meant, in the main, to be truthful, and, though subjected to some interpolations, have been well preserved. The books of Chronicles are later in the date of their composition, and less trustworthy in statement, having been prepared under the influence of a strong sacerdotal bias. Deuteronomy, as a whole, was first published in the VIIth and Leviticus in the Vth century b. c., and each was designed to deceive the people, to add to the importance of Jerusalem, and to enrich a hereditary class of priests.

In the Hebrew Scriptures as accepted by Protestants, about half the space is occupied by history; one-fourth by prophetical books, which are to a considerable extent historical; one-twelfth by the law in Deuteronomy and Leviticus; and the remainder by the Psalms, Proverbs, Song of Solomon, and the personal experiences, real or mythical, of Job, Esther, and Ruth.

SEC. 307. *Myth and Legend.*—Genesis describes the creation of the universe, and tells us that at first there was neither vice nor evil in the world. Everything was harmonious and placid, until man violated a divine command, and thus brought sin, discord, toil, and suffering

into life. Men multiplied and soon became very wicked. "Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." "The earth was corrupt," and was "filled with violence." "It repented the Lord that He had made man." "The sons of God came in unto the daughters of men," and their offspring became "mighty men." "There were giants on the earth in those days,"¹ and the lives of common men were measured not by scores of years but by centuries. Most of the patriarchs between Adam and Noah saw their nine hundredth birthday. In the tenth generation after Adam, and in the sixteenth century of the creation, for the purpose of drowning out the wickedness of man, the Lord sent a great flood which "covered all the high hills that were under the heavens," and destroyed "all the flesh that moved upon the earth" excepting only those persons and beasts that were saved in the ark.² Human life then began anew. In the twelfth generation after Noah, Jacob was chosen by the Lord to be the ancestor of the Hebrews, the chosen people, the favorites of Heaven, the sole recipients among men of divinely revealed religion.

Jacob and his sons became residents of Egypt, where at first they were free and prosperous, but after his death his descendants were oppressed and enslaved. Nevertheless, they increased with such extraordinary rapidity that in the life of Jacob's great-grandson, Moses, they numbered 603,550 fighting men,³ equivalent to a total population of at least 2,500,000 persons. They revolted against the tyranny of the Egyptians, and marched back to Palestine, spending forty years on the way, during which time their leader, Moses, gave them revelations from their divine Master.

When they established themselves in Palestine, the

Hebrews consisted of twelve tribes, each comprising the descendants of one of the sons of Jacob, and each occupying its own district, except that the Levites, or sacerdotal tribe, were scattered through all parts of Palestine. From the time of Joshua to that of Saul, a period of five generations, there was no national unity; the tribes remained independent of one another, or they combined in leagues which had little permanence or power. Their rulers were petty princes or judges, and their government was so weak that "every man did that which was right in his own eyes."⁴ Having no national organization, they were repeatedly defeated and enslaved by the neighboring Philistines.

SEC. 308. *Oscillating Piety*.—At this time the religion of the Hebrews was polytheistic and idolatrous. We are told that they "served the Lord [Jehovah] all the days of Joshua and all the days of the elders that outlived him," but that the next generation "forsook the Lord and served Baal and Ashtaroth. And the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and He delivered them into the hands of the spoilers." After they had suffered the miseries of foreign domination, they cried for help to Jehovah, who gave them release and peace under their compatriot, Othniel, for forty years. After his death, "the children of Israel did evil again in the sight of the Lord" by returning to polytheism, and Jehovah permitted the king of Moab to enslave them for eighteen years. They "cried unto the Lord" again, and He gave them Ehud as a deliverer. "And the children of Israel did evil again in the sight of the Lord when Ehud was dead, and the Lord sold them into the hand of Jabin, king of Canaan, and the children of Israel cried unto the Lord," who again rescued them from the oppressor by the hand of

Barak. "And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and the Lord delivered them into the hand of Midian seven years," and "the children of Israel cried unto the Lord," who sent Gideon to liberate them. "And it came to pass as soon as Gideon was dead, that the children of Israel turned again . . . and made Baal-berith their god." Abimelech and Tola and Jair ruled over Israel, but we are not told of any change in the popular religion in their times. After the death of Jair, the Israelites "served Baalim and Ashtaroth, and the gods of Syria, and the gods of Sidon, and the gods of Moab, and the gods of the children of Ammon, and the gods of the Philistines, and forsook the Lord, and served not Him. And the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and He sold them into the hands of the Philistines."

Thereupon "Israel was sore distressed. And the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, saying, 'We have sinned against Thee, both because we have forsaken our God, and also served Baalim.' And the Lord said: 'Did I not deliver you from the Egyptians, and from the Amorites, from the children of Ammon, and from the Philistines? The Sidonians also, and the Amalekites, and the Moabites did oppress you, and I delivered you out of their hand. Yet ye have forsaken Me, and served other gods; wherefore I will deliver you no more. Go and cry unto the gods which ye have chosen; let them deliver you in the time of your tribulation.' And the children of Israel said unto the Lord, 'We have sinned; do unto us whatsoever seemeth good unto Thee; deliver us only we pray Thee, this day.' And they put away the strange gods from among them, and served the Lord, and His soul was grieved for the misery of Israel."

Jephthah, whom He sent as a liberator, ruled over them

for six years, and Elon succeeded him for ten years, and Abdon was judge for eight years. During these twenty-four years, the Israelites were faithful to Jehovah. "And the children of Israel did evil again in the sight of the Lord, and the Lord delivered them into the hands of the Philistines forty years." They were freed by Samson, who ruled over them for twenty years. After his time, the chronological relations of the story are not very clear. Civil war broke out among the Hebrews, and "all the children of Israel, and all the people, went up, and came to the house of God [in Mizpeh], and wept, and sat there before the Lord, and fasted that day until even, and offered burnt offerings and peace offerings before the Lord."¹ This language gives us an idea of the feeling of the Hebrews towards Jehovah, about the close of the legendary period, as depicted in their Scriptures.

SEC. 309. *The Seesaw Fiction.*—The biblical story of the period of the judges, written by an unknown author at an unknown time, silent as to many of the most important points of national progress and confused as to others, is an unsatisfactory attempt to string together vague traditions or fictions in such a manner as to form a connection between historical times and the earlier mythical period.

Among the traditions of the Hebrews were some that their ancestors had been enslaved repeatedly by heathen nations, and, according to the accepted Jewish philosophy, these national disasters must have been punishments inflicted by Jehovah for popular idolatry. In historical times the kingdoms of Judea and Israel were idolatrous, and were conquered by the heathen, and the conquest was held up by the priests as the inevitable result of apostasy; and, according to their philosophy, the misery

of their ancestors must have been the punishment for sins like those committed in the monarchy. If there were repeated subjugations, there must have been repeated apostasies. It is possible that the authors of these stories were more anxious to give impressive lessons in the profit of piety than to adhere to strict historical evidence.

But whether the Hebrews were conquered by the Philistines, Moabites, and Amorites, as told in the book of Judges, or not, we may be sure that they did not change their religion ten times in less than three centuries. They did not become idolaters after Joshua, and again after Othniel, and again after Ehud, and again after Barak, and again after Gideon, and then after each of these desertions of their traditional religion, all suddenly become devout worshipers of Jehovah. The extreme rarity of revolutions in ecclesiastical systems is one of the prominent facts in authentic history, and the extreme frequency of such changes is one of the remarkable fictions of Hebrew legend. Hereafter we shall find much evidence that neither the Hebrews before, nor Samaritans after, the separation ever recognized Jehovah as their exclusive national divinity, nor did the Jews until nearly three centuries after the time of David.

SEC. 310. *The Hebrew Monarchy.*—The historical period of the Hebrew nationality begins with the monarchy in the first half of the XIth century b. c. Its founder, Saul, of the tribe of Benjamin, after a reign troubled by much domestic and foreign warfare, was succeeded by David, of the tribe of Judah, who held the throne forty years, became more powerful than his predecessor or any of his successors, founded a durable dynasty, and became the favorite of the priests and the hero of national tradi-

tion. His son and successor, Solomon, was the last king of the Hebrews. Immediately after his death the realm was divided into two states; one called that of the Jews, and the other that of the Israelites or Samaritans.

The governments of these kingdoms were grossly despotic. The sovereign was absolute master of the property and lives of his subjects. There was no legislative body, no independent judiciary, no law to which the monarch owed obedience. The chief check to his arbitrary power was the priesthood, which was usually under his control. He found it prudent, however, to comply with the demands of the popular superstition; he could not safely do anything that would have been regarded by the multitude as an offense to the gods.

In countries that are both monarchical and polygynous, custom permits the newly installed sovereign to slay his half-brothers, or other heirs of the preceding monarch, as a protection against their conspiracies and against the plots of dissatisfied provinces or troops. This has been the usage in many ancient and modern states. Its existence in the Hebrew monarchy is indicative of the political culture of the people. When Saul was king, and at the height of his power, David considered it a great favor to become his son-in-law. After some years, when David had gained a reputation as a military leader, and had collected a little army ready to obey him, he defied Saul, attempted to dethrone him, and divorced his daughter. When the king was slain in battle by the Philistines, David seized the crown, and slew the sons of Saul, and the sons of his own repudiated wife.¹

David had sixteen wives; and among these Bathsheba, whom he had taken after he reached middle life, was his

favorite. Whether her influence over him was due to her beauty, her relative youth, or the crimes which her husband committed to obtain her, we do not know, but she had enough of it to secure the throne to her son Solomon, though older sons by other wives had more experience in public business, and were more admired by the multitude. Absalom, the eldest son, and by that fact entitled to the throne under the customs of other countries and also under the Jewish rules of inheritance, was not only a very handsome man, but was also extremely popular. He saw the dangers of exclusion from the throne and of murder, which, in such a political system, would follow his exclusion. He rebelled, drove his father from Jerusalem, and declared himself king. He was slain in battle, and David returned to his capital. Then Bathsheba induced her husband to associate Solomon with him in the royal office, but before this had been done, Adonijah, the son next in age to Absalom, publicly asserted his right to the succession. He was soon dispatched, and we may presume that other half-brothers followed him to the grave. They appear no more in history. The reign of Solomon was the most peaceful and splendid in Jewish history, perhaps in reward for his piety.

Slavery and polygyny were common customs, recognized by law. There was no limit to the number of wives, except that imposed by the poverty of the husband, who besides had almost unlimited privileges in the matters of divorce and concubinage. As an evidence of the greatness of Solomon, his chronicler boasted, perhaps with much exaggeration, that he had seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines.

SEC. 311. *Religious Condition.*—The polytheistic and

idolatrous features of the popular religion were maintained under the Hebrew monarchy. The name of David was derived from that of a heathen god,¹ and so probably was that of Solomon, and also that of Saul, with slight modification. It is significant that a son of Saul was called Eshbaal, and one of David, Beeliada, equivalent to Baaliada.² Many divinities were worshiped at altars in all parts of Palestine, some with obscene rites, and some with human sacrifices. One of the chief objects of adoration in Jerusalem through all this period and many earlier and later generations, was a brazen serpent. When the kingdom of Israel was established, one of the first acts of its sovereign, at a time when he would naturally have been careful to avoid offending any considerable class of his subjects, was to erect two brazen calves or bulls in his capital, Shechem. The Israelites acted as if they had been accustomed to worship such idols in Jerusalem. Not a word of objection from people, soldier, or priest is reported. Baal, Chemosh, Moloch, Astarte, and other heathen divinities had their altars in the Jewish capital, and Jehovah had to wait more than half a century after the foundation of the monarchy before He had a temple. Solomon, who erected it, also built "a high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, on the hill that is before Jerusaleim, and for Moloch, the abomination of the children of Ammon. And likewise did he for all his strange wives, which burned incense and sacrificed unto their gods."³ As Solomon had hundreds of wives, many of them daughters of heathen princes, there must have been a large variety of altars in Jerusalem.

The temple of Solomon was not constructed in accordance with the ideas attributed, at a later date, to Moses. Among its decorations were sculptures of lions and oxen,

and it had colossal cherubim (figures of oxen with the heads of men) fifteen feet high, copied from the palaces of the Assyrians.⁴

SEC. 312. *The Prophets.*—A prominent class of men in the early monarchy, as well as in the previous and succeeding periods of the Hebrew and Jewish history, was that of prophets, men who announced the oracles of Jehovah to kings and people, received and published the divine revelations, wrote the sacred books, preached against idolatry and immorality, and gave counsel in matters of public and private policy. They foretold the prosperity that would follow piety and the adversity that would punish sin, but predictions were made by them only as a minor part of their business. On occasion, they could offer sacrifices, consecrate kings, and perform other sacerdotal offices, reserved in later times to the descendants of Aaron.

The prophetic office required no hereditary qualification. Most of the prophetic books in the Jewish Bible were written by men who did not claim to speak for Jehovah by virtue of their blood. Besides conveying the idea that they were not priests, some of them were rather reformers, and enemies of those ceremonies which furnished revenue and occupation to the custodians of the temples.

Among the prophets we find such names as those of Moses, Joshua, Samuel, Nathan, Gad, Eli, Elisha, Elijah, Isaiah, Daniel, and Amos. Samuel was the spiritual head of the kingdom in the reign of Saul. The chief sacerdotal advisers of David were Nathan and Gad, who are mentioned as his historians in such a manner as to lead to the presumption that they had the credit of writing the book now known as the Second of Samuel.⁵

One of the most influential of the prophets was Nathan, who, after the death of Samuel, was the chief agent of Jehovah in communicating his orders to David. As his story is told in the second book of Samuel, that king had no chief priest, and no son of Levi or Aaron among his councilors. He accepted the anointment as monarch not from Levites but from men of Judah; and when he consulted dice for divine guidance he threw them himself.² The priestly sons of Aaron are mentioned only twice in Samuel's account of David's life, first when the king rebuked them for neutrality during Absalom's rebellion, and second when one of them was associated with the prophet Nathan in anointing Solomon.

As yet there were no sacred Scriptures. If, as is not improbable, the priests had manuscripts of myths, and legends and notes of important historical events, these writings were not received as divine revelations, and they were not so marked or described that we can determine whether any of their text has been preserved in the Jewish Bible of our time.

SEC. 313. *The Jewish Monarchy.*—As did his father David, a member of the tribe of Judah, Solomon made his royal residence in its chief city, Jerusalem. He fortified it with strong walls and adorned it with a royal palace and with numerous places of worship, including the great temple of Jehovah. Jerusalem being near the southern end of Palestine, and neither convenient of access to the majority of the Hebrews nor well situated as a fortress for the defense of the central and northern tribes, the lavish expenditure of money in enriching the capital provoked much dissatisfaction. The result was that when Solomon died, in 977 b. c., most of the tribes,

nominally ten in number, refused to recognize his son and successor, Rehoboam, and established the independent kingdom of Israel. Its first capital was Shechem; its second, Samaria.

The Hebrew monarchy was never a great power, and its weak fragments, Judea and Samaria, increased their weakness by frequent wars with one another. Rehoboam had been on the throne only five years when "Shishak, king of Egypt, came up against Jerusalem, and he took away the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the treasures of the king's house; he even took away all."¹ The Jewish and Samaritan monarchs were usually vassals to Egypt, Syria or Assyria, and in 719 B. c., the kingdom of Israel finally disappeared. Its principal inhabitants were deported, and a century or two later their national character was lost. They have left no descendants to modern times, and they and their institutions have no importance in the history of culture. All that there was of value in the Hebrew blood has been preserved to us by the Jews. The throne of Jerusalem was maintained for a century and a quarter after that of Samaria was overthrown.

SEC. 314. *The Temple, etc.*—The sacerdotal office was not restricted to a hereditary class. Anybody could build an altar anywhere, to any one of a large number of divinities, and could there conduct the ceremonies of worship. So far as we can learn from the Hebrew Scriptures, the priests had nothing to do with the planning, construction, or dedication of the great temple. Solomon was the master of ceremonies at the consecration. He offered the sacrifices, delivered the only address and prayer reported to us, and at the close blessed the congregation. The biblical historian says, "So the king and

all the children of Israel dedicated the house of the Lord."¹ Nowhere in the account of the construction and dedication of the temple as given in the book of Kings, is the priesthood mentioned.

Either Solomon did not dedicate his temple to Jehovah, or the latter was then regarded as one of many divinities, similar to and friendly with Baal, Chemosh, and Moloch. Polytheistic communities are tolerant of strange gods, but strict in requiring that a temple once dedicated to a divinity shall be kept sacred to him. They fear to give offense to any divinity. They may admit friendly gods into a temple, but not unfriendly ones. They would not put the statue of Venus in the temple of Juno, nor that of Mars in the temple of Peace. There is no record in authentic history of the ejectment of a god from his shrine in a polytheistic country, unless by a hostile people after a conquest. Now Jehovah, at least in later times, was conceived as a god who was hostile to all other gods. No statue, no priest, no altar no symbol of another god, could be admitted into His temple without a gross insult to Him. Yet we know that vessels for the worship of Baal were kept in the temple,² and this fact implies that priests of Baal resided in the temple and conducted their ceremonies there.

Of the eighteen kings who reigned over Judea before the captivity, beginning with Rehoboam in 977 and ending with Zedekiah in 586 b. c., a period of nearly four centuries, ten were idolaters, six were lukewarm worshipers of Jehovah, and only two were so strictly pious that they destroyed the altars of the heathen gods. These two were Hezekiah, who began to reign in 725 b. c., and Josiah, who took possession of the throne about 638 b. c.

The untrustworthy character of the history given in the Jewish Bible is made evident by a comparison of the accounts of the reigns of David, Hezekiah, and Josiah. Of the first we are told that "his heart was perfect with the Lord,"³ an assertion inconsistent with the fact that during his reign the brazen serpent was worshiped in Jerusalem. Of Hezekiah it is said that "he removed the high places and brake the images and cut down the groves" of the idolaters; "he trusted in the Lord God of Israel; so that after him was none like him among the kings of Judah nor any that were before him."⁴

About a hundred years after Hezekiah, when the royal dynasty of David was approaching the end of its career, Josiah reached the throne. "He put down the idolatrous priests whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn incense in the high places in the cities of Judah and in the places about Jerusalem; them also that burned incense unto Baal, to the sun, and to the moon, and to the host of heaven. And he brought out the grove from the house of the Lord. . . . And he brake down the houses of the Sodomites that were by the house of the Lord. . . . And he defiled Topheth, which is in the valley of the children of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or daughter to pass through the fire to Moloch. . . . And the high places that were before Jerusalem, which were on the right hand of the mount of corruption, which Solomon the king of Israel had builded for Ashtoreth, the abomination of the Zidonians, and for Chemosh, the abomination of the Moabites, and for Milcom [Moloch], the abomination of the children of Ammon, did the king defile. . . . Moreover, the altar that was at Bethel . . . he brake down. . . . And like unto him there was no king before him, that

turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses, neither after him arose there any like him.”⁵

The heart of David was perfect with the Lord; but Hezekiah was more pious than any earlier or later king; and so also was Josiah. Much faith is needed to discover consistency in these statements. If what is told of Hezekiah be true, David permitted idolatry; and if what is told of Josiah be true, then the idolatrous temples of Solomon were not destroyed by Hezekiah. The general inference is that the kings and people generally practiced idolatry, and that rites as vile as those of the worst heathens, human sacrifices not excepted, were familiar in Jerusalem till the reign of Josiah.

Accepting as true the very questionable assertion that Hezekiah prohibited idolatry, we infer that the Jewish monarchy had existed for two hundred and fifty years before it found a ruler who treated idolatry as a crime. One of the biblical authors apologizes for toleration by saying that “as yet the people had not prepared their hearts unto the God of their fathers.”⁶ This means that, notwithstanding all the statements of the priests to the contrary, the Hebrews and Jews generally had never considered Jehovah their exclusive divinity.

The idolatrous figures of beasts placed in the temple by Solomon were supplied with companions by later sovereigns. Among these were horses, presumably of bronze, dedicated to the sun, and placed near the entrance,⁷ at an unknown date. Manasseh, who began to reign in 695 b. c., built “altars for all the host of heaven” in the precincts of the temple, and erected there a graven image of the grove,⁸ probably a figure not suited for precise description.

Sec. 315. *Hilkiah's Book*.—About the year 620 b. c., when Josiah, then on the throne, was twenty-six years old, the chief priest, Hilkiah, found a book called "the law of the Lord, given by Moses."¹ This book was read before the king, and when he heard it, "he rent his clothes," and he said to Hilkiah and three other priests, "Go, inquire of the Lord for me . . . concerning the words of the book that is found." The object of their inquiry was to learn whether Hilkiah's book really was a divine revelation, and whether it should be the sacerdotal law of the kingdom. The work was evidently new and unknown. There was no ancient copy of it; no records of a tribunal that had enforced its provisions; no class employed since ancient times in copying it; no school in which its interpretation had been studied; no congregation of priests who had lived by its rules; no tradition that it had been known in earlier times. Instead of going to the priests of the temple, who were not only the proper custodians of sacred books, if there were any, but also the proper persons to declare the oracles of Jehovah, Hilkiah and his associates went to a prophetess, a feminine fortune-teller, who gave them the following communication from the Lord God of Israel :—

"Behold I will bring evil upon this place, and upon the inhabitants thereof, even all the words of the book which the king of Judah hath read; because they have forsaken Me, and have burned incense unto other gods, that they might provoke Me to anger with all the works of their hands; therefore My wrath shall be kindled against this place, and shall not be quenched. But to the king of Judah, which sent you to inquire of the Lord, thus shall ye say to him, 'Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, as touching the words which thou hast heard,

because thine heart was tender and thou hast humbled thyself before the Lord, when thou heardst what I spake against this place, and against the inhabitants thereof, that they should become a desolation and a curse, and hast rent thy clothes and wept before me, I also have heard thee,' saith the Lord. 'Behold, therefore, I will gather thee unto thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered unto thy grave in peace; and thine eyes shall not see all the evil which I will bring upon this place.' "

After receiving that communication as a divine revelation confirming the sacred authority of Hilkiah's book, king Josiah "went up into the house of the Lord, and all the men of Judah, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem with him, and the priests, and the prophets, and all the people great and small; and he read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant which was found in the house of the Lord. And the king stood by a pillar, and made a covenant before the Lord, to walk after the Lord, and to keep His commandments, and His testimonies, and His statutes, with all their heart and all their soul, to perform the words of this covenant that were written in this book. And all the people stood to the covenant."

King Josiah "commanded Hilkiah, the high priest, and the priests of the second order, and the keepers of the door, to bring forth out of the temple of the Lord all the vessels that were made for Baal, and for the grove, and for all the host of heaven, and he burned them. . . . And he put down the idolatrous priests whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn incense in the high places in the cities of Judah. . . . And he took away the horses that the kings of Judah had given to the sun at the entering in of the house of the Lord, . . . and

the altars which Manasseh had made in the two courts of the house of the Lord. . . . And he slew all the priests of the high places. . . . Moreover, the workers with familiar spirits, and the wizards, and the images, and the idols, and all the abominations that were spied in the land of Judah, and in Jerusalem, did Josiah put away, that he might perform the words of the law, which were written in the book that Hilkiah, the priest, found in the house of the Lord.”²

Hilkiah's book, thus accepted as a divine revelation by the Jews, is not described by the biblical historian in such a manner that it can be unmistakably identified. He does not mention it as the Pentateuch, or as containing five parts. He does not say it gave accounts of the creation of the world, of the early history of mankind, and of the career of the chosen people after the selection of Jacob as their progenitor. But he says it provided for the celebration of the passover, which is a prominent feature in Deuteronomy. It made death the penalty for idolatry and witchcraft, as does Deuteronomy. It limited the right of the priesthood to the Levites, as does Deuteronomy. It was known to Jeremiah, the contemporary of Hilkiah, as was Deuteronomy, and as the other books of the Pentateuch were not. Therefore we must conclude that Hilkiah's book was Deuteronomy.

Before the time of Josiah, the Jewish priests often spoke of “the law of Moses,” meaning either some few commandments or a system of unwritten rules. The new book produced by Hilkiah purported to have been written, at least eight centuries before, by the most famous of the Hebrew prophets. It introduced many new ideas into Judea. It was the first book of revelation known to the Jews. It comprised many precepts of

civil, criminal, and ecclesiastical law. It provided that it should be read to all the Jewish people at certain festivals. It thus gave a popular and educational character to their religion. It made them "the people of the book," and gained a popular authority, higher than that of any older revelation. It demanded study. It provoked thought and discussion. It educated scribes and commentators. It made schools of interpreters. It laid the basis for traditions and sects, for Pharisees and Sadducees.

It prohibited worship at all places save the one where the shrine of Jehovah was established, and that place in the time of Josiah was Solomon's temple in Jerusalem. It abolished the old rule that a sacrifice must be offered whenever a beast was slain, and reduced slaughter for food to a profane business.

SEC. 316. *The Captivity.*—In 586 b. c. the first Jewish monarchy reached a disastrous end. Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonian monarch, captured Jerusalem, broke down its walls, burned its temple, royal palace, and all its good dwellings, blinded the king, after slaying all his sons before his eyes, and then took him and his principal subjects into captivity. Nine years before this destruction of the Jewish capital, Nebuchadnezzar had besieged and taken it, and then "he carried away all Jerusalem, and all the princes, and all the mighty men of valor, even 10,000 captives, and all the craftsmen and smiths. None remained save the poorest sort of people."¹ After the second capture and deportation, relatively few of the Jews were left in Judea, and yet those few rebelled against the Babylonians, and then, fearing punishment, "all the people, both small and great, and the captains of the armies, arose and came to Egypt,"² where they made their homes.

Nebuchadnezzar took his captives to Mesopotamia, where he established most of them in a district by themselves, and allowed them to preserve their language, customs, and religion. Except that they were not permitted to leave their district, they enjoyed a considerable degree of liberty. They tilled the soil for themselves, and were allowed to accumulate property. They had their priests, their prophets, their religious meetings, and their law, which they read and cherished.

SEC. 317. *Synagogue*.—The synagogue, the most important original feature of the Jewish religion, a house for worship, with gospel reading, lecture, song and prayer without sacrifice,—was introduced by an unknown person, at an unknown time and place, probably in Mesopotamia during the captivity. It was a natural out-growth of the circumstances of a people who had a sacred law that was to be read periodically to “men, women, and children;” to a people of strong national feeling, who regarded this reading as one of the strongest bonds of their union; to a people whose seventh day was sacred to ideas of worship; and to a people who were forbidden to erect any temple or altar in the land of their exile. This people established the custom of meeting, at first, presumably, in private houses or in the open air to hear their law, and afterwards in buildings erected for the purpose. Every synagogue had its copy of the books of Moses, and its reader, who read a portion of the law on every Sabbath day. Not unfrequently explanatory remarks were made by a rabbi, a man who had made a study of the text. The privilege of speech was not limited to personages of an official character, there were times when any man of Jewish blood, faithful to the traditions of his people and of good repute, could

express his opinions upon the meaning of the law, and take part in the discussions that might ensue. No priesthood was necessary in any person connected with the synagogue.

The demand for copies of the sacred books, to be read in these houses, trained a class of copyists, or scribes, who made a study of the text, and the discussions led to interpretations and comments which became parts of the national traditions, and were recorded in writings, the summaries of which are preserved in the Talmud. The synagogue became the center of the intellectual life and religious education of the people; it was almost as important to them as the assembly was to the Athenians in the age of Pericles. It gave to them a longing to read, a familiarity with the Mosaic law, a fondness for discussion, an exceptional mental activity, a consciousness of superiority over their heathen neighbors, and a confidence in their national cohesion. Popular feeling demanded that every town with ten Jewish families must have its synagogue, and the rule was generally observed in Mesopotamia, Egypt, Syria, Greece, Italy, and other countries of antiquity, and has come down to our times.

The synagogues had a large influence, not only in educating the Jews, and giving them a strong attachment to their law, but in bringing the Hebrew Scriptures into their present shape, in developing that strong nationality which has triumphed over the cruellest and most enduring persecutions to which a people was ever subjected, and also in laying the foundation for Christianity.

The synagogue is not mentioned in the Pentateuch or in the historical books of the Old Testament.¹ It was an afterthought, the result of the concurrent influences of the possession of Deuteronomy by the Jews, their desire

to study it, the destruction of their temple, and their captivity in Mesopotamia. Their new house of worship became a nucleus for social, educational, and charitable movements; and, as copied by the Christians, and developed by them into the parish church, it became the admirable basis of the modern ecclesiastical organization.

SEC. 318. *Predictions.*—The rebellion of the ten tribes and the Babylonian captivity were great humiliations to the national pride of the Jews, and might well cause them to doubt whether they were the chosen people of Jehovah, or whether He was the supreme master of the world. Under a creed which promised immediate and adequate rewards in wealth, power, and worldly prosperity to piety, the situation for the Jewish priests at Babylon was difficult. They claimed that their people were appointed to enjoy a perpetual national existence and pre-eminence as the favorites of heaven, and yet their people were in exile, poverty, weakness, bondage, and in danger of total dispersion and extinction. Similar cases have occurred in other nations, and the sacerdotal explanation has always been the same in its main features. The people were not pious enough; they deserved even more punishment than they suffered.

The Jewish priests and prophets could not give relief from the evils of the present, over which they had little control, but they could assert a large jurisdiction over the remote future. They could promise better times to later generations. And they were very liberal in such promises. They predicted that all the descendants of Jacob should be reunited in an everlasting monarchy; that the founder of the new kingdom should be a Messiah, an anointed king, an heir of David, who, as the founder of the Jewish dynasty and its most powerful monarch, was

regarded as a pattern of piety and a special favorite of Jehovah; that his capital should be Jerusalem, to which all the heathen nations should pay tribute; that the temple of Jehovah should be rebuilt, and that His priesthood, His sacrifices and His law should be maintained forever. The following passage from Ezekiel, author of one of the latest prophetic books, is a striking sample of such predictions:—

“Therefore will I save my flock. . . . And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them. I the Lord have spoken it. . . . And I will make them and the places round about My hill [Jerusalem] a blessing; and I will cause the shower to come down in his season; there shall be showers of blessing. . . . And they shall no more be a prey to the heathen, neither shall the beast of the land devour them; but they shall dwell safely, and none shall make them afraid.”¹

An heir of David, qualified by his blood to lead the people in a war of liberation and to reign over them afterwards, was the only Messiah foretold in the Scriptures, and the only one hoped for by the zealots. The predictions of such a hero, like many others in the prophetic books, were never verified; but they stimulated the national feeling of the Jews, contributed to preserve their language, blood, and faith, and prepared them for the re-establishment of their government in Judea.

In 538 b. c. Cyrus became master of Babylon, and among his subjects, found the Jewish colony in Mesopotamia. He soon treated them with favor. Perhaps he learned that they hated idolatry, that they had a religion

akin to his own, that they were not strong enough to maintain their national independence, and that because of their hatred for the Babylonians, Assyrians, and Egyptians, they would be faithful to his interests.

SEC. 319. *The Return.*—An order issued by Cyrus, at an unknown date, permitted the Jews in Mesopotamia to return to Judea, but it led to no result worthy of note, perhaps because it did not provide for restoring to them their land or any political power. Under the Babylonian rule, Syrians and others had occupied the vacant estates, and Jews coming among them might be treated as enemies. In the seventh year of King Artaxerxes I.—that is about 458 b. c.—a new decree was issued to authorize the return of the Mesopotamian Jews to Judea, under conditions highly favorable to them. A document purporting to be a copy of this decree is given in the book of Ezra. It says: “Artaxerxes, king of kings, unto Ezra the priest, a scribe of the law of the God of heaven, perfect peace. . . . I make a decree that all they of the people of Israel and of His priests and Levites in my realm, which are minded of their own free will to go up to Jerusalem, go with thee. . . . And to carry the silver and gold, which the king and his counselors have freely offered unto the God of Israel, whose habitation is in Jerusalem, and all the silver and gold that thou canst find in all the province of Babylon, with the free-will offering of the people. . . . And I, even I, Artaxerxes the king, do make a decree to all the treasurers which are beyond the river [Jordan] that whatsoever Ezra the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven, shall require of you, it be done speedily. . . . And thou, Ezra, after the wisdom [book] of thy God, that is in thine hand, set magistrates and judges, which may judge all

the people that are beyond the river, all such as know the laws of thy God, and teach ye them that know them not. And whosoever will not do the law of thy God, and the law of the king, let judgment be executed speedily upon him, whether it be unto death, or to banishment, or to confiscation of goods, or to imprisonment."¹

Under this order Ezra returned to Palestine, accompanied by 42,360 Jewish freemen, including women and children. He took possession of Judea, expelled the heathen occupants whom he found there, rebuilt Jerusalem, appointed judges, installed priests, and organized the political and ecclesiastical affairs according to his ideas.

The despotic power over the land and people of Judah conferred on him by Artaxerxes was used by Ezra with energy, and in a highly effective manner. He did not permit any persons, save worshipers of Jehovah of pure Jewish blood, to dwell in Jerusalem or to hold land in Judea. Every heathen, every alien, every Hebrew who had an alien wife and adhered to her, had to go. No worship was allowed save that of Jehovah; no person, unless recognized officially as a descendant of Aaron, could hold the priestly office. By such regulations, strictly administered, he had the satisfaction of seeing the Jewish nation reconstituted. He installed a new priesthood, with a sacred book, presumably the Pentateuch, much of which was new in its composition, and all of which was new in its arrangement, as the authoritative law of the whole nation. After long delays he saw the temple rebuilt, and the walls of the city restored. To him belongs the chief credit of having made the ancient Jews a distinct and peculiar people, with that strong ethnological vitality that endures to our own times.

As reorganized by Ezra, Judea was a Persian province

under a Jewish governor. The landowners and free-men were all or nearly all Jews. Remaining loyal to the Persian king, occupying a position where they could be of service to him, and enjoying his confidence and favor, they were peaceful and prosperous. They multiplied rapidly and increased by the return of many Jewish exiles from Babylonia and Egypt. For more than a century the policy of Ezra was maintained, and in this period the national character and religion became permanently fixed.

The books of Isaiah and several other prophets, many of the Psalms, and much of the material of Judges, Samuel, and Kings, were in existence before the reign of Josiah, but were not brought together in one collection, nor, with the exception of the Psalms, were they regarded as of divine authority. In the period of the captivity or in the following century, copies of these writings and of Deuteronomy were carried into Babylonia and Egypt, where, in the following century, they were beyond the reach of the innovating priests in Judea, who would, presumably, have been glad to destroy them or bring them into harmony with the books and institutions of Ezra.

The books of Chronicles were probably written by some priest after the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, for the purpose of promoting the interests and gratifying the feelings of his sacerdotal associates. He took the bulk of his information from the books of Samuel and Kings, but materially changed the story by additions and omissions, and in his predominant tone substituted a sanctimonious unction for simple narrative.

He omitted to mention David's adultery with Bath-sheba, his murder of Uriah, the worship of the brazen

serpent of Moses by the Jews for six centuries, the vessels of Baal kept in Solomon's temple, and the horses of the sun erected at its entrance. He changed the charge made by David on his deathbed to his successor. On that occasion, according to the older record, the chief thoughts of "the sweet Psalmist of Israel" at the approach of death were to secure posthumous gratifications of his hate. At the time of Absalom's rebellion, David had been cursed by Shimei, of the house of Saul, a house which David had treated with base ingratitude. After the death of Absalom and at a time when the restoration of peace was not yet secure, David had sworn to spare Shimei; but when about to die, he said to Solomon, "His hoar head bring thou down to the grave with blood." Joab had been the chief captain of the army, during the last half of David's reign. He defeated the rebellion of Absalom. Like his master, however, he had murdered some of his enemies, and thus had seriously offended the king, who, for fear or shame, did not venture to punish these crimes. But to Solomon he said, "Let not his hoar head go down to the grave in peace." These malignant injunctions were accompanied by another to walk in the way of Jehovah with all his heart and all his soul. Those were all the points in David's charge as given word for word in the First Book of Kings.²

Instead of that charge, the chronicler reports literally two charges, both entirely different from the one in the earlier book.³ In these later addresses David delivered to Solomon incredible amounts of precious metal (100,000 talents of gold, equivalent in weight to \$1,200,000,000 and 1,000,000 of silver, equivalent in weight to \$1,000,000,000), vast stores of bronze, stone, and tim-

ber, collected for the projected temple, and plans for the building. These plans had been communicated to David by Jehovah "in writing by His hand." One historian knows nothing of the collection of stores for the temple, and the other nothing of Shimei and Joab.

The canon of the Jewish Bible, as we now have it, with the exception of some minor additions and interpolations, was presumably made up in the III^d century b. c. by priests of the second temple, and was accepted as of divine authority by all the Jews who remained faithful to the Mosaic law current among them during the captivity.⁴ The Septuagint translation into the Greek, made at Alexandria about 270 b. c., is a guaranty for the existence of the Pentateuch at that time.

After the age of Alexander the ancient Jews have little culture-historical interest, except as they are connected with the origin of Christianity. In regard to their later political condition, it is sufficient for my purposes to add that, having been subject to Macedonian and other rulers for nearly two centuries, in 138 b. c. they re-established their national independence, which they maintained until 63 b. c., when they became subjects of Rome. In 70 A. D. their city was destroyed, and most of them were driven into exile.

Except in the case of Hilkiah's law, which is not described in such a manner as to enable us to identify it clearly, the Hebrew Bible does not tell us that any of its books, when first made known, was publicly accepted by the authorities of the state as a divine revelation. Ezra's law was imposed on the Jews by the decree of Artaxerxes, and was accepted by them, perhaps because Ezra had the power to enrich the submissive and to destroy the disobedient. Most of the books in the Jewish

Scriptures were first accepted as divine revelations by unknown authorities at unknown dates. Many were written by persons whose names have not been preserved. The Jewish Bible as a whole grew up in obscurity, just as if the Jewish prophets and priests had no conception of the importance of their work for distant times and lands, and as if they had no desire to let the world know how they obtained their inspiration.

Before the reign of Josiah the Jews were polytheists; after the conquest of Alexander they come into view as monotheists. We have no means of tracing the causes of the change. Perhaps familiarity with the religion of Zoroaster and with Ahura Mazda, the good spirit of the Persians, a god who had no proper name, had its influence on them.

Adhering to the beliefs that they were a peculiar people of superior righteousness, the especial favorites of heaven, that their monarchy was to be restored, and that it was to dominate over other nations, they considered it necessary to keep their blood pure; and therefore refused to intermarry or to associate intimately with the Gentiles. When they could do so with safety, they showed their dislike of the heathen and their hostility to the rites of heathen worship. Greeks and Romans spoke of them as “enemies of the human race.”

SEC. 320. *Three Periods.*—Having told in preceding sections how and when the Mosaic books were accepted as of divine authority, I shall now proceed to examine some of their notable features, and to explain the traces of the gradual development of their ecclesiastical system. The history of the ancient Jews, so far as it is of interest to culture, extends from 1100 to 300 b. c., and comprises three main divisions. Of these the first is the prophetical

period before 620 b. c., when the prophets were the chief representatives of Jehovah; when a man of any tribe could be prophet or priest; when the prophets were the most influential personages of the sacerdotal class; when it was lawful to build an altar and sacrifice anywhere; when the blood of every beast slaughtered for food was offered as a sacrifice; when polytheism and idolatry were common; and when El was a common, if not the favorite, name for the divinity afterwards known as Jehovah; when no portion of what is now known as the Mosaic law had been written; when there was no sacred Scripture among the Jews; but when they already had much of what are known to us as the books of Isaiah, Amos, Hosea, Micah, Nahum, Samuel, Kings, Psalms, and Proverbs.

The second division, from 621 to 458 b. c., was the Deuteronomical period, when the sacerdotal office was restricted to the Levites; when the book of Deuteronomy was published and was accepted by the kings, as a divine revelation; when the Jews were conquered and their capital and temple destroyed by the Babylonians; when all the chief families among them were deported to Mesopotamia; when, during their captivity, they became zealous worshipers of Jehovah in accordance with the commands of their newly adopted law; when the books of Jeremiah, Obadiah, Zephaniah, and Joel were published; when the prophets sank into relative insignificance unless, like Jeremiah or Ezekiel, they were of Levitical blood; when the priesthood of Levi became powerful; when the synagogue arose with didactic congregational worship, and with social and charitable features new in ecclesiastical institutions; when the passover and various other ceremonial observances commanded

in Deuteronomy came into use; and when the Mosaic religion took a definite shape.

The third and Levitical period, covering a century and a half after the return of Ezra, is characterized by the publication and acceptance of Leviticus and its related chapters in Numbers and Exodus; by the enforcement of the new ecclesiastical discipline prescribed in those books; by the compilation of the Pentateuch as a whole; by the composition of the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Ezekiel, and Malachi; by the collection and arrangement of the Hebrew Scriptures as we now have them; by popular and priestly recognition of them as divinely inspired; by their translation into the Greek language; by the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the temple; by the reorganization of the government; by the remarkable influence of their Bible on the character of the Jews; and by the development of their strongly-marked and peculiar nationality.

The evidences of evolution in the ecclesiastical system of the Jews may be found in numberless passages of their Scriptures relating to the authority of their prophets; to the qualifications, pedigrees, and ordinations of their priests; to the establishment of the office of high priest; to the observance of festivals; to the places and modes of sacrifice; to the name and anthropomorphic character of the divinity; to the prevalence of polytheistic ideas and of idolatrous practices; to defective ethics; to the composition, publication, acceptance, custody, and reading of the law; and to the lack of originality in ideas and institutions.

For the first period, our authorities are the books of Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Amos, Hosea, Nahum, and Judges; for the second period, Deuteronomy, Joshua, a

portion of the second book of Kings, and some interpolations in the earlier historical writings; and for the third period, Leviticus, portions of Exodus and Numbers, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. By the comparison of the three classes of authorities, their disagreements become evident, and the motives of the later sacerdotal writers are made intelligible.

SEC. 321. *Prophets*.—The books of Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Amos, Hosea, and Psalms convey the impression that, when they were written, there was not only no hereditary priesthood, but that Jehovah selected agents in every tribe of Hebrews to convey His revelations to mankind, and that His favorite representatives, those to whom He intrusted the most important commissions, those to whom He delivered his direct instructions most frequently, those whom He selected to write His sacred books and to rule His chosen people as sacerdotal judges, were not priests but prophets. Not until more than three centuries after the foundation of the monarchy did a prominent prophet or the author of a Biblical book claim to be a descendant of Aaron; and this fact cannot be explained by any theory except the one that the passages conferring an exclusive hereditary priesthood on the Aaronites were written or interpolated at a later date.

If the Aaronites had been the only priests of Jehovah in the time of Joshua, they would surely have appeared prominently in the early records of the Jewish people. They would have had a center of worship and a chief priest acting as the presiding judge of Israel. They would have exercised a great influence for the maintenance of political unity. But the book of Judges does not know of their existence.

Next to Moses, the greatest of the prophets was Joshua, an Ephraimite. He received the divine instructions by direct revelation, he took the oracles by lot, he built an altar, he read the law to the people, he governed them as the representative of Jehovah, without ever consulting an Aaronite or chief priest, and he divided the promised land among the tribes. After him the noted judges who ruled over Israel as representatives of Jehovah were Gideon of Manasseh, Tola of Issachar, Jephthah of Gad, Ibzan of Judah, Elon of Zebulon, Abdon of Ephraim, Samson of Dan, Eli of Levi, and Samuel of Ephraim. All these rulers seem to have been sacerdotal representatives of Jehovah, with general charge over ecclesiastical as well as over political affairs. When the people tired of the rule of priest judges in the time of Samuel, and demanded a king, Jehovah complained that "they have rejected Me, that I should rule over them,"¹ as if all their Hebrew judges until that time had been his immediate agents. The idea is conveyed that this was the first time in the national experience when the people had objected to theocratic, that is, sacerdotal rule. When the office of political and ecclesiastical chief was transferred from Eli, the Levite, to Samuel, the Ephraimite, by divine order, no mention was made of Aaron, as there would have been if his inheritance had been in question. After the captivity, it was observed that the story of Samuel did not agree with the claim of the priests, and a genealogy showing the descent of Samuel from Aaron was written.³

One of the leading figures in the Old Testament is Samuel, who got into the sacerdotal profession, not by inheritance, but because of a vow made by his mother.⁴ His father had nothing to do with the service of Jeho-

vah.⁵ He became a prophet. To Saul, who was seeking a divine oracle, Samuel said, "I am the seer,"⁶ and the explanation is given that "a prophet beforetime was called a seer."⁷ The language had changed after the days of Samuel before this part of the record was written. Some years later some messengers of Saul found a "company of the prophets, and Samuel standing as appointed over them."⁸ In all this book we do not read that Samuel was installed or anointed as a priest, he had no priests among his subordinates, and yet in his time he was the highest sacerdotal agent of Jehovah. He announced the divine revelations, he ruled over the chosen people, and he anointed Saul and David to be kings.

The prophetic books written before the captivity contain no recognition of exclusive or even of superior sacerdotal authority in the descendants of Levi or Aaron. They do not mention any chief priest or his office, or refer to its influence. Their silence on this point is intelligible only on the theory that there was no well organized hereditary priesthood in their day. Indeed, if there had been such a priesthood, the prophetic office would not have existed, and the prophetic books would not have obtained the credit which secured their admittance among the sacred Scriptures of the nation.

When we compare the prominence of these prophets in Jewish history with the relative insignificance of the priests said to have been contemporaneous with them; when we remember that they were the only sacerdotal authors of sacred books before the reign of Josiah; when we put Moses by the side of Aaron, and Joshua by the side of Eleazar, and Nathan by the side of Zadok; when we remember that for long periods of the national life no mention is made of priests save in books written after

the return from Babylon; when we remember also that these late books were written by priests who also had the custody and the copying of the older books, and could forge and interpolate without fear of punishment; and when we remember that, so soon as the priesthood of Aaron obtained control of the government under Ezra, the prophets disappeared,—when we recall all these points, a suspicion necessarily arises that the priesthood of Aaron was of late origin, and was attributed to early times for the purpose of increasing its power and revenue.

SEC. 322. *Levite Priests.*—Although the claim of the Levites to be the hereditary priests of Jehovah by an exclusive right is rarely mentioned, and then only by interpolation presumably, in the books of Judges, Samuel, Kings, and the prophets, it becomes a prominent feature in Deuteronomy. In that book we are told that “the Lord separated the tribe of Levi to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand before the Lord, to minister unto Him, and to bless in His name, and that the Lord thy God hath chosen him [Levi] out of all thy tribes to stand to minister in the name of the Lord, him and his sons forever.”¹ “The Lord is their inheritance.” A Levite coming from another city to Jehovah’s sanctuary shall have the right to minister there “in the name of the Lord his God, as all his brethren, the Levites, do.”² A favorite phrase with the author of Deuteronomy is “the priests, the Levites,” and by it he conveys the idea that priest and Levite were to him equivalent words. Thus he says, “Thou shalt come unto the priests, the Levites . . . and they shall shew thee the sentence of judgment,” that is, they shall exercise the judicial power. He says, “The priests, the sons of Levi, shall come near . . . and by their word shall every con-

troversy and every stroke be tried.”³ The judicial office was associated with sacerdotal authority in theocratic governments, and in Deuteronomy every Levite was qualified by inheritance to become priest and judge.

Deuteronomy gives no prominence to Aaron, and never makes him the recipient of any direct revelation, either alone or in association with Moses. Neither does it resemble Leviticus in distributing the menial labor of the sanctuary among other families of Levites, leaving the priesthood proper as the exclusive inheritance of Aaron and his descendants. A portion of the book of Joshua was written or interpolated by the author of Deuteronomy or by one of his school.⁴

SEC. 323. Aaronite Priests.—According to Leviticus and Numbers, all the higher sacerdotal authority and all the privileges of speaking in the name of Jehovah were given to Aaron and his sons, the priests. The Lord was “their inheritance.” They were to have control of the tabernacle, temple, and ecclesiastical revenue. The other members of the tribe of Levi were to fill subordinate positions in the service of the priesthood, as musicians, ushers, dancers, attendants, servants, and laborers.¹ There are no uncertain or conflicting verses in these two books. In Leviticus, which might properly be called Aaronicus, more than forty verses declare in the most unmistakable terms that the priesthood belongs to Aaron and his descendants, and that the other Levites should be the temple servants of the Aaronites. We read of “Aaron and his sons,” “the sons of Aaron,” “Aaron’s sons,” and of direct revelations by Jehovah to Aaron, with a frequency and a meaning for which there is no parallel in Deuteronomy.

In the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah we

find the same conception of the priesthood as in Leviticus and Numbers, and the same frequent mention of the distinction between the priests and the other Levites. In the Chronicles we are told that "Aaron was separated that he should sanctify the most holy things, he and his sons forever, to burn incense before the Lord, to minister unto Him, and to bless in His name."² Ezra took care to give his own pedigree, showing his descent in the direct male line from Aaron. In passages relating to sacerdotal affairs, his book and that of Nehemiah use phraseology similar to that of the writer of Chronicles, which last is a work of late date and of little credit. The author of the earlier and more trustworthy historical books knew nothing of sacerdotal pedigrees, and evidently attached no superior importance to descent from Aaron.

After the Levites had received from Hilkiah and Josiah the equal and exclusive right of acting as priests of Jehovah, and had enjoyed that right for nearly two centuries, though without opportunity of exercising it during most of that period, why did Ezra degrade the great majority of the tribe to the menial branches of the sacerdotal profession, and reserve the honorable and profitable priesthood for the sons of Aaron? The circumstances suggest the reply. In the small and struggling colony who were trying to rebuild Jerusalem and the temple, there were too many Levites for the priestly office. There was neither sacerdotal business to occupy their time nor revenue to support them. It was a necessity of the situation that most of them should be reduced to subordinate positions.

The best way to correct the evil was to limit the priesthood to a small proportion of the Levites. The founder

of their tribe, Levi, had eight grandsons, and twenty-one great grandsons, among whom Aaron was one. If the story in Joshua be true, the descendants of Aaron were assigned to the sacerdotal offices in the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Simeon,³ the tribes which afterwards formed the kingdom of Judah. When the Jews were led into captivity, the Levites among their number were descendants of Aaron, and at the reorganization of the nation, Ezra, an Aaronite, was clothed with almost absolute political and ecclesiastical power. He was custodian, compiler, and publisher of the sacred books. As a priest, he saw that to rule over other priests he ought to be their chief, and that he might avoid some serious difficulties by limiting the sacerdotal office to the sons of Aaron. He could invent his own pedigree and limit the priesthood to those Levites who belonged to Judah. And so he did.

SEC. 324. *The High Priest.*—The book of Leviticus creates the office of chief priest, and provides that he shall observe rules more strict than those imposed on other priests. He must not go out of the sanctuary, nor uncover his head, nor marry a widow or divorced woman, nor go into a room where any dead body lies, even if it be of his father or mother; “for the crown of the anointing oil of his God is upon him.”¹ In Deuteronomy and the sacred books written before Ezra, we find no mention of the high priest, his anointment, his peculiar sanctity, or of his participation in any public ceremony.

Samuel was the leading priest of the Hebrews in his time. For many years he was their chief ruler. He anointed Saul and David as kings. He received many inspired messages from Jehovah. According to tradition,

tion, he wrote at least portions of the books that bear his name. But in those books he is never called the high priest, nor is any mention made of his anointment. In the latter part of the reign of David, and under Solomon, there was no high priest. We are told that in both reigns "Zadok and Abiathar were the priests."² Shortly before the death of David, Abiathar joined the party that tried to put Adonijah, the elder brother of Solomon, on the throne, and in punishment for his blunder he was expelled from the priesthood.³ After that event Zadok was "the priest," a title which had been given to him on previous occasions, but he was never called "the high priest" or "chief priest." When Saul, David, Solomon, Rehoboam, and their successors were installed, and when the temple was dedicated, the high priest should have officiated, and his name and office should have been mentioned, but we look in vain for them in the Hebrew Scriptures.

If the office of high priest had existed throughout the history of the Hebrew nation from the exodus to the secession, and throughout the history of the Jewish kingdom till the captivity, its influence would have caused many results which did not occur. It would have given us a list of the high priests with the pedigree and pontifical term of each. It would have established a strict sacerdotal discipline that did not appear till the time of Ezra. It would have lifted priest above prophet. It would have given the keeping of the annals and the composition of the historical books to the members of the regular sacerdotal profession.

From the time when Ezra established theocratic rule in Judea, about 444 b. c., until the Christian era, there was always a high priest and there were no more prophets.

The reasons for this were that the sacerdotal business of the Jews was concentrated in the hands of a family which claimed to be the descendants of Aaron in the main line of inheritance, and that all the acts of worship were performed in the temple at Jerusalem. There was no longer any occupation for prophets, and therefore they ceased to exist.

SEC. 325. *The Secession.*—From the account of the division of the Hebrew monarchy, as given in the First Book of Kings, and this is the most trustworthy story of the occurrence, it is evident that there was then no well organized priesthood of either Levites or Aaronites established in all the large towns of Palestine, with a chief priest in Jerusalem. Such an organization would have exerted a powerful influence in many ways to prevent a division of the nation, and in case of failure all would have migrated to Judea, or would have insisted on the establishment of an independent church under a national high priest in the new kingdom. But the historian of the secession knew nothing of any important sacerdotal influence in the affair. There was no protest of the priests, no demand for a temple of Jehovah in Shechem, no migration of Levites, nor were the Levites counted as part of the population faithful to the dynasty of David in Jerusalem. The Jewish kingdom after separation included only "the house of Judah and Benjamin." The "ten tribes" who seceded with Jeroboam included the bulk of the Levites. As with the Levites, so with the Israelitish people. They showed no attachment to the temple of Solomon; they made no pilgrimages to it, no lamentations about their political separation from it, no such disturbance as the people of Bavaria, Spain, or Portugal would make to-day, if their king should try to cut them

off from Rome. In short, the story as told in the book of Kings clearly shows that the separation of the Hebrews into two kingdoms was not considered at the time to have any significance in ecclesiastical affairs. Everybody could set up his own altar, everybody could be a priest, and everybody could worship any one of numerous divinities without giving offense to public opinion. The exclusive divinity, the exclusive sanctuary, and the exclusive sacerdotal authority of Aaron had at that time no hold on the Hebrew people.

SEC. 326. *Micah*.—A suggestive story is told in the book of Judges about Micah, a Hebrew of the Ephraimite tribe, who, having a silver idol of Jehovah, weighing about one hundred ounces, set up in his house a chapel for regular worship, and consecrated one of his sons as its priest. Afterwards he withdrew the priesthood from his son and conferred it on a Levite whom he “consecrated,” and to whom he gave ten shekels and a suit of apparel every year besides his food. The word Jehovah is not used in the authorized English version of this story, but it is in the Hebrew; and several expressions show that Micah and his mother, who furnished the money for the idol, were both zealous worshipers of Jehovah. At least, so the story in its present shape would have us believe; but the presumptions indicate very clearly that the original document represented Micah to be the worshiper of Baal or some other heathen divinity, and that some pious scribe thought it would look better to change the name of the god. Either such an interpolation was made or Jehovah was worshiped in the form of an idol. It is evident that Micah knew nothing of the prohibition of image worship, of the limitation of the sacerdotal office to the blood of Aaron, or of the limitation

of the chief acts of worship to the place where the ark of the covenant was kept in Judea. In other words, the books of Moses did not exist in the time of that scribe.

SEC. 327. *Many Altars*.—Before the accession of Josiah in the VIIth century B. C., the Hebrews had a place of sacrifice in every town. We are told that Jehovah said, "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto Me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings and thy peace offerings, thy sheep and thine oxen; in all places where I record My name, I will come unto thee and I will bless thee."¹ This means that wherever the children of Israel should rear an altar to Him, thither He would come to bless his worshipers.

Joshua built an altar at Mount Ebal in Canaan, and afterwards set up the tabernacle at Shiloh, where, of course, he built an altar.² In neither case did he explain that the spot thus chosen was to be visited by all Hebrews who had sacrifices to make, nor did he refer to the fact that his selection of a site was not final. Not long after the death of Joshua, "the angel of the Lord appeared to Gideon, of the tribe of Manasseh, in Ophrah, and said to him, 'Build an altar unto the Lord thy God upon the top of this rock . . . and offer a burnt sacrifice.' . . . Then Gideon took ten men of his servants, and did as the Lord had said unto him."³ No Aaronite or Levite participated in the sacrifice. Manoah, a Danite, and his wife made an offering to Jehovah by the command of an angel, who ascended to heaven in the flame of the sacrifice; and in reward for their devotion, a child who became the distinguished warrior Samson was born to them. No Aaronite or Levite officiated on that occasion, and the only altar used was erected by Manoah, and never consecrated by a priest.⁴

In the time of the Judges there were altars to Jehovah at Ophrah, at Mizpeh, and at Gibeah.⁵ Samuel offered sacrifices at Mizpeh, Ramah, Gilgal, and Bethlehem.⁶ While Saul was in favor with Jehovah, he built several altars, the first of which was at Bethaven.⁷ David sacrificed at Bethlehem and at the threshing floor of Arauneh.⁸ Elijah, who was a great prophet of Jehovah, after the completion of Solomon's temple repaired the altar of Jehovah at Carmel and sacrificed there.⁹

That the Israelites in the time of David were accustomed to sacrifice at many places, and knew of no law to the contrary, is shown by the following passage: "And Solomon . . . made an end of building his own house and the house of the Lord; . . . only the people sacrificed in high places because there was no house built unto the name of the Lord until those days. And Solomon loved the Lord, walking in the statutes of David, his father; only he sacrificed and burnt incense in high places. And the king went to Gibeon to sacrifice there, for that was the great high place. A thousand burnt offerings did Solomon offer upon that altar. In Gibeon the Lord appeared to Solomon in a dream by night."¹⁰ Here we have a distinct statement that the people and the king (while the latter was favored with direct revelations from Heaven, and while he was building the temple under the directions of Jehovah) were in the habit of sacrificing at different places, "because there was no house built unto the name of the Lord." The mention of the lack of a house as a cause of sacrificing at many places proves that nothing was known of Deuteronomy and Leviticus.

SEC. 328. *An Exclusive Sanctuary.*—According to Deuteronomy, Jehovah spoke thus to the Hebrews

through Moses: "When ye go over Jordan, and dwell in the land which the Lord your God giveth you to inherit, and when He giveth you rest from all your enemies round about so that ye dwell in safety, then there shall be a place which the Lord your God shall choose to cause his name to dwell there. Thither shall ye bring all that I command you, your burnt offerings and your sacrifices, your tithes and the heave offerings, and all your choice vows which ye vow unto the Lord. . . . Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place that thou seest, but in the place which the Lord shall choose in one of thy tribes, there thou shalt offer thy burnt offerings, and there thou shalt do all that I command thee."¹ This implies that soon after the conquest of Palestine the exclusive sanctuary should be established, and should remain forever the place of worship for all the descendants of Jacob.

The historical books of the Bible nowhere assert that, during the seven centuries before Josiah, worship among the Jews was ever limited to one sanctuary. The idea of making such an assertion does not seem to have occurred to them. In the time of Joshua, "the whole congregation of Israel assembled together at Shiloh [in the land of Ephraim], and set up the tabernacle of the congregation [with the shrine of Jehovah] there;"² and that was its proper place until the completion of Solomon's temple, a period of more than three centuries. Yet never do we read that this was the only place of worship.

In the book of Judges, covering three centuries, Shiloh, which should have been the chief city, is not once mentioned. When the Hebrews "cried to the Lord" for pardon, when they put away their strange gods, when

they wept and humiliated themselves, and confessed their sins, and promised to be faithful to Jehovah, and when He reproached them for their desertion, and accepted their word, and granted them relief, we should expect to read that there was some great gathering and pious demonstration at Shiloh, and that the high priest, the son of Levi or Aaron, absolved them from their sins. But we seek in vain for any mention of a shrine of Jehovah, an exclusive place of worship, a great pilgrimage, Shiloh, or a high priest on such an occasion.

The Hebrews never enjoyed the rest, from their enemies, that was to bless them when the time came for the erection of their temple. Within less than a quarter of a century after the completion of that structure, they divided into the two hostile kingdoms of Judea and Samaria; for two centuries and a half they were engaged in almost constant warfare with each other or with their neighbors, and for an additional century Judea struggled alone in vassalage, until she too was extinguished. According to the orthodox theory, the Hebrews had the promise of the temple for twelve generations and its enjoyment for one generation, before they separated into two nations.

SEC. 329. *Slaughter*.—It was a rule of many nations of antiquity that no domestic animal should be slaughtered for food except as a sacrifice to the gods. This custom prevailed among the early Hebrews, as well as among their heathen neighbors. By a few words the butcher could consecrate any stone as an altar, and could request the divinities to feast upon the blood, or life, of the victim. The ceremony was neither long, complex, nor costly; it was pious without being troublesome. It gave to the gods nothing save the blood, which men

generally did not want. But when it was prohibited to make a sacrifice anywhere save at one sanctuary in the nation, the conditions, of the butcher's business and of the meat supply, demanded the abandonment of the rule that every slaughter must be a sacrifice. To the Hebrews who might dwell at a distance from the national sanctuary the author of Deuteronomy said: "When the Lord thy God shall enlarge thy border, as He hath promised thee, and thou shalt say, I will eat flesh because my soul longeth to eat flesh; thou mayest eat flesh, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after. If the place which the Lord thy God hath chosen to put His name there be too far from thee, then thou shalt kill of thy herd and of thy flock, which the Lord hath given thee, as I have commanded thee, and thou shalt eat in thy gates whatsoever thy soul lusteth after. . . . Only be sure that thou eat not the blood, for the blood is the life. . . . Thou shalt pour it upon the earth as water."¹

The rule that a domestic animal might be slain for food without offering its blood to Jehovah did not suit the author of Leviticus. He said: "What man soever there be of the house of Israel that killeth an ox or lamb or goat, . . . and bringeth it not unto the door of the tabernacle to offer an offering to the Lord, . . . that man shall be cut off from among his people."² It may be asserted, though there is nothing to justify the assertion, that this regulation of Leviticus was intended to apply only to the period of the wanderings in the wilderness; but even then a population of 3,000,000³ in a desert country must often have been scattered over a wide area, so that it would be very inconvenient for them to be limited to a single slaughter house.

SEC. 330. *Sacrifices.*—The Hebrew Scriptures provide that Jehovah should be worshiped with the sacrifice of animals, whose blood was to be smeared, and whose fat was to be burned, on the altar; but they do not explain why such usages should give pleasure to the Deity. The Jewish priests evidently accepted the sacerdotal practices of their heathen ancestors without supposing that it was necessary to give or to demand reasons.

The passages in the Pentateuch relating to sacrifice, as in reference to many other subjects, are scattered about in different books, badly arranged, and conflicting. They treat of the kinds of animals to be used, of the occasions when sacrifices may or must be made, of the numbers required at different times, of the ceremonial observances suitable to the various occasions, and of the methods of slaughtering the animals and disposing of their parts.

The sacrifices consisted of two main classes, which might be named public and private. The public sacrifices were those instituted for regular observance recurring at times precisely fixed in the law. The private sacrifices consisted of individual offerings occurring at times not so fixed. The animals publicly sacrificed were either sheep, goats, or neat cattle, young males and without blemish. No old, lean, sickly, lame, or blind beast was accepted by the priests. They expected to eat the meat, or part of it, and they demanded the best. One of the prophets thus cursed the man who selected the worst for the temple. “And if ye offer the blind for sacrifice, is it not evil? And if ye offer the lame and sick, is it not evil? Offer it now unto thy governor, will he be pleased with thee or accept thy person? saith the Lord of hosts. . . . Cursed be the deceiver which hath in his flock

a male, and voweth and sacrificeth unto the Lord a corrupt thing."¹ For private sacrifices the poor could sometimes bring chickens or doves, but these were not regarded with favor.

The public sacrifices were those which recurred every morning and evening, at the beginning of every month, and at the great annual festivals. The daily morning and evening sacrifices required each a lamb; the sacrifice on the first day of each month demanded two bullocks, a ram, seven lambs, and a goat; and during the annual festivals there was to be a sacrifice every day, not less than at the beginning of the month. In the seven days of the annual festival of the seventh month, however, seventy bullocks, fourteen rams, ninety-eight lambs, and seven goats became victims.² Every public sacrifice of a bullock, sheep, or goat was accompanied with an offering of flour, oil, and wine. The private sacrifices were divided into those known as peace, trespass, sin, purification, and burnt offerings; for each of which classes, special directions were given in Leviticus.

As among the savages and the heathen barbarians generally, so also among the Hebrews, the sacrifices were regarded as "the food" of the gods, and were so styled in the sacerdotal speech.³ Jehovah feasted on the flesh, but he delighted especially in the fat and the blood; and the fat and the blood belonged to him exclusively. Trespass upon his right to these delicacies was a capital crime. He said to his chosen people, "Ye shall eat no manner of fat of ox, or of sheep, or of goat. . . . Whosoever eateth the fat of the beast of which men offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, even the soul that eateth it shall be cut off from his people. . . . Whatsoever soul it be that eateth any manner of blood, even that

soul shall be cut off from his people.”⁴ The gods are entitled to eat the soul or life, of the victim and “the life of the flesh is in the blood.”⁵ “The priest shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar . . . and burn the fat for a sweet savor unto the Lord.”⁶

SEC. 331. *Sacrifice Denounced*.—Although the books of the Pentateuch devote many verses and even chapters to the importance of sacrifices, and of tribute to the priests, yet the prophets had very little to say in favor of offerings and some of them bitterly denounced the ceremonial observances. Through Jeremiah, Jehovah thus addressed the Jews: “Amend your ways and your doings and I will cause you to dwell in this place. Trust ye not, in lying words, saying, ‘The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these.’ For if ye thoroughly amend your ways and your doings; if ye thoroughly execute judgment between a man and his neighbor; if ye oppress not the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow, and shed not innocent blood in this place, neither walk after other gods to your hurt; then I will cause you to dwell in this place, in the land that I gave to your fathers forever and ever. . . . I spake not unto your fathers nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices.”¹

Isaiah had a similar revelation. To him Jehovah said: “I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of goats. When ye come to appear before Me, who had required this at your hand, to tread My courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto Me; the new moons and the sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed

feasts, my soul hateth ; they are a trouble unto Me; I am weary to bear them.”²

In the same strain was the word of Jehovah delivered to Amos: “I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell [the sweet savor of the sacrifices] in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer Me your burnt offerings and your meat offerings, I will not accept them.”³

Micah is another prophet who knew of no command for sacrifices and pompous ecclesiastical festivals. Through him Jehovah said to the Jews: “O My people, remember . . . the righteousness of the Lord. Wherewith shall I come before the Lord and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before Him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? . . . He hath showed thee, O man, what is good. And what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?”⁴

In a similar spirit Jehovah revealed His words to the Psalmist : “ I will take no bullock out of thy house nor he goats out of thy folds ; for every beast of the forest is Mine and the cattle upon a thousand hills. . . . If I were hungry, I would not tell thee, for the world is Mine and the fullness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats?”⁵

Considered together, these passages plainly indicate that the leading prophets did not recognize any revelation ordering numerous sacrifices and great ecclesiastical feasts. Such denunciations of the ceremonial observances were not designed to have a brief or local application ; they are comprehensive as to space and time ; they imply that,

when written, the authors did not know the Mosaic books or did not accept them as genuine. "The sins rebuked by the prophets Joel, Amos, Hosea, Micah, Isaiah, are such as we still hold to be sins. . . . But in these writers we read nothing about periodical fastings, ceremonial cleanliness, incense burning, sacrifice of beasts, sabbaths, sabbatical years, jubilees, new moons, and other festivals; little about tithes and first fruits, nothing about the genealogy of priests and Levites, threefold presentation of the person every year at Jerusalem, sacrificing at Jerusalem only, unclean meats, or any other part of the yoke which neither Peter nor his fathers were able to bear."⁶

SEC. 332. *Festivals*.—Not only were the Israelites commanded to take all their offerings and tithes to the sanctuary, but they were required to drive to it all the firstlings of their herds, or, if the distance were too great, to sell these firstlings and spend the price in feasting at the sanctuary. "Thou shalt eat there before the Lord thy God, and thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household."¹ These firstlings or their proceeds could be taken to the sanctuary at one of the three great annual feasts. "Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before the Lord thy God in the place which he shall choose; in the feast of unleavened bread [the Passover in the spring], the feast of weeks [in midsummer], and in the feast of tabernacles [in the autumn], and they shall not appear empty before the Lord. Every man shall give as he is able."² Of these festivals the Passover was the most important. Every family, or at the utmost two families, should sacrifice a lamb, which must be eaten within twenty-four hours, or, if part be not eaten, the surplus must be burned, and the blood of the lamb should

be smeared on both sides of the main doorway of the house.³ After reaching the Promised Land, this sacrifice must be made only at the national sanctuary, where the males must spend seven days of the Passover festival. If this ceremony had been observed during the reigns of David and Solomon, as required in Deuteronomy, it would have called together imposing throngs of the people, and herds of sheep. Roads and sanctuary cities would have been jammed. The census of David found that the nation numbered 1,300,000 adult males, "valiant men that drew the sword."⁴ These men required more than 400,000 lambs that should all be slain in one day, and in the court of one tabernacle or temple and at one altar. Any person who has seen a slaughter house where a hundred beeves are slaughtered in a day can imagine that the servants of the Hebrew tabernacle had some work to do when the day of the Passover sacrifice arrived.

The feast of weeks, in midsummer, lasted only one day, and was the least important of the annual festivals. In the autumn, on the tenth day of the seventh month, came the festival of the atonement, which is commanded in Leviticus, but not mentioned in Deuteronomy. At this feast the Hebrews were required to "afflict their souls, and offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord."⁵ Every adult male Hebrew must appear at the sanctuary of Jehovah to make his offering. Five days later came the tabernacle feast, which continued for eight days; Leviticus says, "Seven days ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord; on the eighth day shall be a holy convocation unto you, and ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord."⁶

Since there was an interval of only five days between

the festival of the atonement and that of the tabernacle, the Hebrews whose homes were distant from the sanctuary would necessarily spend at least fourteen days there on that occasion, and with seven days at the Passover, and one at the feast of weeks, twenty-two days every year. Besides their stay at the sanctuary, most of them must give two days to the journey each way, or, in the aggregate, twelve days of travel, or more than a month in the year for these festivals.

But while the majority of the Hebrews might reach the sanctuary in two days, many of them would spend a week. The distance from Jerusalem or from Shiloh to the remotest districts of Palestine was more than a hundred miles by any road, over a mountainous country, and when people traveled afoot, and were also taking with them their families or their young boys, and, perhaps, driving their firstlings or their animals for sacrifice, they would not average more than twenty miles a day, especially where the opportunities of finding pasture for their cattle would be scarce as in Palestine, which, according to the report of David's census, must have had more than six hundred inhabitants to the square mile. The three annual festivals required all the Hebrew men in the extreme north of Palestine to be absent from their homes for at least six weeks between the middle of March and the beginning of December. At these times all outskirts of the nation would have been left without protection against robbers or invaders; and yet, in the books of Judges, Joshua, Samuel, and Kings we do not read that at such times the remote provinces were attacked or that the gatherings of the men at their sanctuary were ever used as occasions for anointing priests or kings, or organizing military enterprises.

Moses ordered that the autumn festival in every seventh year should be celebrated with special solemnity, and that then his book of the law should be read to all the people, men, women, and children, gathered at the sanctuary. But no historical book mentions such a festival. Nothing is said of the reading of the law; of the extensive arrangements that must have been made to render the reading audible to millions of people; of the precautions to prevent damage by invasion while the people were collected at one place; of the lamentation about inability to make the pilgrimage at those times when the Hebrews were held captive by heathen nations; or of the strong impression caused by the vast multitude of worshipers and animals for sacrifice encumbering the roads, and gathered three times annually at Shiloh, from the days of Joshua to those of Solomon, and at Jerusalem from the completion of the temple until the separation of the Hebrews into two independent kingdoms. Such silence is very suggestive.

SEC. 333. *Sabbatical Years.*—According to Leviticus, “the Lord spake unto Moses in Mount Sinai, saying: . . . ‘Six years shalt thou sow thy field, and six years thou shalt prune thy vineyard and gather in the fruit thereof; but in the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, a sabbath for the Lord; thou shalt neither sow thy field nor prune thy vineyard. That which groweth of its own accord of thy harvest thou shalt not reap, neither gather the grapes of thy vine undressed; for it is a year of rest unto the land. . . .’

“And thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years unto thee, seven times seven years; and the space of the seven sabbaths of years shall be unto thee forty and nine years. Then shalt thou cause the trumpet of the jubilee to

sound on the tenth day of the seventh month, in the day of atonement, shall ye make the trumpet sound throughout all your land. And ye shall hallow the fiftieth year, and proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof; it shall be a jubilee unto you; and ye shall return every man unto his possession, and ye shall return every man unto his family. A jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you; ye shall not sow, neither reap that which groweth of itself in it, nor gather the grapes in it of your vine undressed. . . . And if ye shall say, ‘What shall we eat the seventh year? Behold, we shall not sow nor gather in our increase.’ Then I will command My blessing upon you in the sixth year, and it shall bring forth fruit for three years. And ye shall sow the eighth year and eat yet of old fruit until the ninth year.”¹

If these septennial and semi-centennial periods of rest had ever been observed in Israel, they would have deserved an important place in the historical books of the Hebrew people, and impressive mention in the Psalms and prophetical writings; but, as a matter of fact, they are not mentioned as having ever been observed or made the subject of comment in the times of the monarchs.

SEC. 334. *Sacerdotal Revenue.*—The Pentateuch provided liberally for the support of the priests. They were to live a life of secure ease. They were to have a tenth part of all the crops of the fields and of all the increase of the herds;¹ and besides they were to have a large part of the offerings made in the temple whether of beasts, of flour, of oil, or of wine. Numbers says: “Every oblation of theirs [the Israelites], every meat offering of theirs, and every trespass offering of theirs, which they shall render unto Me shall be most holy for thee

[Aaron] and for thy sons. In the most holy place shalt thou eat it; every male shall eat it; it shall be holy unto thee. This also is thine; the heave offering of their gift, with all the wave offerings of the children of Israel. I have given them unto thee, and to thy sons, and to thy daughters with thee, by a statute forever; everyone that is clean in thy house shall eat of it. All the best of the oil, and all the best of the wine, and of the wheat, the first fruits of them which they shall offer unto the Lord, them have I given to thee.”²

“ Everything devoted in Israel shall be thine [Aaron’s]. Everything that openeth the matrix in all flesh, which they bring unto Jehovah, whether it be of men or beasts, shall be thine; nevertheless the first born of man shalt thou surely redeem, and the firstling of unclean beasts shalt thou redeem. But the firstling of a cow, or the firstling of a sheep, or the firstling of a goat, thou shalt not redeem; they are holy; thou shalt sprinkle their blood upon the altar, and shalt burn their fat for an offering made by the fire, for a sweet savor unto Jehovah. And the flesh of them shalt be thine, as the wave breast and as the right shoulder [of other sacrifices] are thine.”³

In the XVth chapter of Deuteronomy we find a different command addressed, not to the Aaronites, but to all the Hebrews: “All the firstling males that come of thy herd and of thy flock thou shalt sanctify to the Lord thy God. Thou shalt do no work with the firstling of the bullock, nor shear the firstling of thy sheep. Thou shalt eat it before the Lord thy God, year by year, in the place which the Lord thy God shall choose, thou and thy household.”⁴ The differences between the two passages are strongly marked. One is addressed to the Aaronites, the other to the people; one sanctifies all the

firstlings, and the other only the males among them; one gives all the firstlings to the priests, and the other orders the owners of the herds to feast themselves, their families, and their friends on the firstling males at the sanctuary.

SEC. 335. *Law School, etc.*—Nowhere in the Old Testament is there any mention of a teacher learned in the law of Moses, or of a controversy about its interpretation, or of a school for its study, or of an oral or written commentary upon it like the Talmud, or of a class that made a business of copying it, or of sects of Pharisees and Sadducees which differed about its meaning. All these things existed after the Vth century B. c., when the Pentateuch was certainly in the hands of the Jews; and the lack of them in earlier times is very suggestive.

According to Deuteronomy, one of the commands of Jehovah was that after the establishment of the Hebrew monarchy, every king should “ write him a copy of this law [of Moses] in a book out of that which is before the priests, the Levites; and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life.”¹ Neither in the historical nor in the prophetic books do we find any mention of this command, or any complaint of its neglect. Priests and kings, prophets and historians had evidently never heard of its existence. The Psalms and Proverbs, attributed to the two most powerful rulers of the Hebrew monarchy, do not suggest any knowledge of this command or show any familiarity with the law to which it refers. The prophets never cited or commented on the phraseology of the Mosaic law; they had never seen it.

Deuteronomy, the last of the Mosaic books, as arranged in the Hebrew Bible, purports to contain the injunctions of the great Hebrew lawgiver to his people

when he felt that death was drawing nigh. It says: "And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests, the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto the elders of Israel. And Moses commanded them, saying, 'At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the feast of tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before the Lord thy God, . . . thou shalt read this law before all Israel in their hearing. Gather the people together, men and women and children and the stranger that is within thy gates, that they may hear and that they may learn, and fear the Lord your God, and observe to do all the words of this law.' . . . Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, 'Take this book of the law and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee.'"² These instructions for the custody, copying, and periodical reading of the law were unknown to the priests and kings before Josiah. The book was not only never copied, never read in public, never cited as an authority in judicial or sacerdotal affairs, and never mentioned as being in the ark, but when found was unknown to anybody. When the temple of Solomon was consecrated, the ark of the covenant was brought in and opened with great ceremony. Here is the official record:—

"And king Solomon and all the congregation of Israel that were assembled unto him, were with him before the ark, sacrificing sheep and oxen, that could not be told nor numbered for multitude. And the priests brought in the ark of the covenant of the Lord unto his place, into the oracle of the house, to the most holy place, even under the wings of the cherubim. For the cheru-

bim spread forth their two wings over the place of the ark, and the cherubim covered the ark and the staves thereof above. And they drew out the staves, that the ends of the staves were seen out of the holy place before the oracle, and they were not seen without; and there they are unto this day. There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel when they came out of Egypt.”³

After the ark had been thus opened, Solomon delivered his address of dedication, with not one word about the book of the law, or its loss, or the order of Moses that the book should be kept in the ark, or the importance of searching for it and restoring it to its place. These topics did not occur to anybody at the time, so far as we can learn from the Bible, nor were they made the subject of remark by the authors or compilers of the Jewish historical books of later times.

After Joshua had crossed the Jordan and had entered the Promised Land, he built an altar of “whole stones, over which no man had lifted up any iron, and he wrote there upon the stones a copy of the law of Moses which he wrote in the presence of the children of Israel.”⁴ The idea is here conveyed that the copying of the law of Moses occupied a brief space of time. It was not the work of a whole day, much less of a succession of days. The brevity of the time, as well as the scantiness of the available space, indicates that “the law” as there used could not have meant more than the ten commandments.

SEC. 336. *The Divine Name*.—The proper name of the God of the Jewish Bible is Jehovah, as it is popularly known, or Yahveh, as it is written by leading biblical

scholars. When Moses was directed to communicate his revelations, according to the story in Exodus, he said unto the Lord: "Behold, when I come unto the children of Israel, and shall say unto them, 'The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you,' and they shall say to me, 'What is His name?' what shall I say unto them? And God said unto Moses, . . . Thou shalt say unto the children of Israel, 'The Lord God [Jehovah Elohim, in Hebrew] of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, hath sent me unto you. This is My name forever.'"¹ The words Jehovah Elohim in the Hebrew are translated "the Lord God" in English, but as lord and god are common nouns they are not exact translations of the proper name Jehovah Elohim, which means Jehovah God. Elohim is a plural form and originally meant gods, in which signification it is sometimes employed in the Hebrew Scriptures; but usually it conveys the idea of a divinity in the singular.

The translators of the English Bible have avoided the proper name of Jehovah, and have substituted the common noun lord in its place. Genesis in the Hebrew has Jehovah one hundred and seventy times, and in the English version of King James, not once. The first chapter of Deuteronomy has Jehovah twenty-five times in Hebrew and not once in the English version. The Hebrew Bible has it more than three thousand times; the English Bible only four. The New Testament in Greek also avoids the name Jehovah.

The aversion of Christians to the word which the God of Jacob said should be "My name forever" is based on the idea that any proper name of a god is polytheistic. A god who calls himself Jehovah puts himself on a level

with Baal, Chemosh, Moloch, Osiris, and Zeus. Such a name is necessary to a national divinity; but is inconsistent with the conception of a god who pervades the universe and is alone in his kind. A deity who is the only divine being is simply "God" or "the Lord." To give him a personal name is to deny by implication that he is the only one of his kind; it implies that he must be distinguished from his rivals. For the purpose of adapting the Jewish Bible to enlightened thought, it was a matter of good policy to exclude the word Jehovah, except in very few places, from the English translation; but that exclusion is a condemnation of the author of the Pentateuch and a proof that fidelity of language was a secondary object with the translators.

There is much reason to believe that Jehovah was not adopted as the national God of the Hebrews until after the foundation of the monarchy. There was a time when He was unknown to the children of Israel. He said to Moses, "By My name Jehovah was I not known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob."² The title of Israel, meaning, "El is a warrior," plainly shows that when that word was adopted to designate the Hebrew people, their chief divinity was El, not Jehovah. Other indications are found in the names of the patriarchs, judges, prophets, and kings till after the time of Solomon. The Babylonian deities, Baal and Moloch, contributed names for the children of Saul and David. Saul's sons were Jonathan, Malchishua (from Moloch), Abinidab, and Eshbaal. Jonathan had one son, Meribbaal, or, as he was called by one biblical writer, Mephibosheth, *bosheth* meaning shame, being considered more suitable for a pious tongue to speak than Baal. On the same principle the name of Eshbaal was converted into Ishbosheth.³

The sons of David were named Amnon, Chileab, Absalom, Adonijah, Shephatiah, Ithrean, Solomon, Shamua, Shobab, Nathan, Ibhar, Japhia, Elishama, Beeliada, and Eliphaleth. Of these, three were named after heathen gods, three after Jehovah, and three after El. It is incredible that Saul and David, if devout worshipers of Jehovah, with such counselors as the prophets Samuel and Nathan, could have named their children after Baal, Moloch, and other heathen divinities.

With these names compare those of the kings of Judah after Solomon: Rehoboam, Abijam, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehoram, Ahaziah, Joash, Amaziah, Azariah, Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, Amon, Josiah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. Out of this last list of eighteen names, all save five have the initial Je or Jo or terminal iah, indicative of derivation from Jehovah. Among the patriarchs and early prophets we find no such names as those of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Obadiah, Zephaniah, and Zechariah, all of whom were born after the IXth century b. c. In the earlier times pious princes gave the names of heathen gods to their sons; and under the Jewish monarchy idolatrous kings named their sons after Jehovah. There are many queer things in the story of this chosen people.

It is a significant fact that in a large number of the Psalms, Jehovah rarely appears, and Elohim frequently. Thus in the thirty-three Psalms from XLII to LXXIV inclusive, the latter name is used six times oftener than the former.

SEC. 337. No Monothecism.—Orthodox Christian writers claim that the Hebrew Scriptures contain the earliest teaching of the doctrine of monotheism; but when we look critically at these books, we find that the doc-

trine is not there. It is irreconcilable not only with a multitude of passages in the Mosaic books, but with the fundamental principles of the Jewish religion. The worship of a national god is polytheistic; it implies a belief that every nation should have its own god. A monotheistic deity, the divine father of all mankind, could not say as Jehovah said to Jacob, "I am the Lord God of thy father Abraham," or, as he said to the Israelites, "Ye shall be holy unto Me, for I . . . have severed you from other people, that ye should be Mine;" or, as He said of them, that He had chosen them to be "a peculiar people above all the nations that are upon the earth," and "high above all other nations."¹ The universal deity could not have given to one nation for its exclusive knowledge and guidance, the only true revelation and the only divinely commissioned priesthood, such as the ancient Jews claimed that they had received by the favor of Jehovah.

He claimed to be "the God of gods," "great above all gods," "greater than all gods."² The last expression was used by Solomon after he became "the wisest of men," and at a time when he received direct revelations from Heaven, and also when many other gods were worshiped in his country. In his address at the dedication of Jehovah's temple, he said, "There is no god like Thee." The book of Genesis tells us that "the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men," before the flood. According to Job, "the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them." A prophet of Jehovah told King Ahab that Jehovah held a heavenly court, "with all the host of heaven standing by Him on His right hand and on His left."

The Mosaic law forbids the Jews to worship any god

save Jehovah, to make any "covenant with their [the Philistines'] gods," or to "mention the names of other gods;" and he told them, "Fear not the gods of the Amorites." He promised that He would punish "all the gods of Egypt." He called the Moabites "the people of Chemosh;" and when the Jews took heathen wives,³ He said in Malachi that Judah "hath married the daughter of a strange god." When He was indignant at the apostasy of the Israelites, He told them to "go and cry unto the gods which ye have chosen." On many occasions He declared that He was a jealous God, jealous of other gods.

He promised to make Jerusalem the home of His heart forever;⁴ and He would always dwell with His chosen people in the land of Canaan, which was to be their "everlasting possession." He was a resident of Palestine. He had a professional as well as an ethnological and territorial specialty. He was "a man of war," the "God of hosts," "mighty in battle," and He "fought for Israel."

SEC. 338. *Henotheism*.—Although there are many monotheistic expressions in the Hebrew Scriptures, there is not one broad and unmistakable declaration of monotheistic belief, much less any conclusive evidence that such a faith was distinctly conceived and accepted by the Jewish people or priests at any period before the captivity.

The most impressive chapter in the Bible, as an expression of henotheistic or monotheistic belief, is Psalm XIX, which says: "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth His handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where

their voice is not heard. Their light is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath He set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it; and there is nothing hid from the heat of it.

"The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

But the Psalms generally are narrowly Jewish in spirit, claiming that the divine favor belongs to the children of Israel exclusively, and that the only proper place for worship is Palestine. They exalt the God of Israel, the Lord of hosts, the glory of Zion, the dynasty of David, the people of Jehovah, and the everlasting covenant between Him and the descendants of Jacob; and they heap special curses on the Assyrians, the Philistines, the Midianites, the Amalekites, the Moabites, and the Ishmaelites.

When the Jewish Scriptures are interpreted by the rules applied to the sacred books of the Brahmins and ancient Egyptians, those expressions which are apparently monotheistic become really henotheistic. They mean, not that there is only one divinity in existence, but that, for the time at least, there is only one whom the worshiper will recognize. The book of Menu says that the most important of all duties is to get a true knowledge of the "one supreme God;" that all the rules of good conduct are comprised in "the knowledge and

adoration of one God;" and that the universe was created by "the sole self-existing power." Ancient Egyptian scriptures say, "The one God, living by truth, who makest all things, . . . almighty God, self-existent, . . . existent from the beginning." And again, "Glory to Thee who hast begotten all that exists, . . . who hast no being second to Thee, . . . the Light of the world."¹ But, notwithstanding these and a multitude of similar expressions much stronger and broader than anything found in the Jewish Bible, the book of Menu is thoroughly and unquestionably polytheistic; and so was the faith of the ancient Egyptians; as is the Pentateuch by the same principles of interpretation.

SEC. 339. *Anthropomorphism*.—Many biblical passages indicate that, like the contemporaneous heathen, the Jews had rude conceptions of their divinity. They spoke of Jehovah as if He had the physical form, the imperfect knowledge, and the hasty passions of humanity. They tell us that "God created man in His own image," that is, in the same material "likeness"¹ or mould. The mental nature was not the same, for man had not yet learned the difference between good and evil. Jehovah worked and "rested from all His work."² He walked "in the garden in the cool of the day;" He spoke audibly to Adam, Noah, Abraham, Abimelech, Isaac, Jacob, and Moses, and He appeared visibly to Abraham, Jacob, and Moses.³ With the latter He spoke "mouth to mouth," "face to face," and "as a man speaketh with a friend." On one occasion when the great prophet wanted to see the glory of Jehovah, the latter would not exhibit anything but his back.⁴ At another time the Hebrew divinity was more gracious, for when "Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel" went

up upon Mount Sinai, they "saw the God of Israel, and there was under his feet a paved work of sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness."⁵ Jehovah promised to "dwell among the children of Israel,"⁶ and His home was between the cherubs.

His anger frequently outran His judgment, and He made menaces which He did not fulfill. He threatened to destroy Sodom unless it could produce fifty righteous men; and four times at the solicitation of the more merciful Abraham, He reduced the number.⁷ He declared His intention of exterminating the idolatrous Israelites, but after Moses had explained how His name would be brought into discredit by the destruction of His chosen people, He said, "I have pardoned according to thy word."⁸ On another occasion, within a few days after the seventy elders had seen their Deity on Mount Sinai, the holy nation worshiped the golden calf under the priestly ministrations of Aaron, and then Jehovah told Moses to hold his tongue, so that the divine wrath could be gratified without interference; but, nevertheless, Moses did interfere, and again succeeded in obtaining mercy for the offenders.⁹ Before the flood He repented that He had made man,¹⁰ and repeatedly afterwards He repented for the mistakes which He had made, or had intended to make.

SEC. 340. *No Immortality.*—There is only one point in which the Hebrew Scriptures can claim to be original, at least as compared with all other sacred books, and that is in the denial of a future life. The idea of man's mortality is distinctly conveyed in many passages of the Mosaic books, and especially in those relating to the first sin and its punishment. After Adam had eaten the forbidden fruit, Jehovah said to Himself, "Behold the man

is become as one of us, to know good and evil; and now, lest he put forth his hand and take also of the tree of life and eat and live forever"—and thereupon the offender was driven from paradise with the curse : "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return."¹ The plain meaning of these words is not contradicted or explained away in any other part of the Bible, but is confirmed in many passages.

When Jehovah chose Abraham to be the progenitor of the holy nation of Israel, and made a covenant to be the God of the Hebrews, promising that they should be a populous and prosperous nation and should have "all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession," and defining the mutual obligations of service on both sides, not one word was said of reward in a future life to the faithful worshipers.² Abraham's subsequent willingness to sacrifice his son elicited a promise of great blessings for himself and his posterity without the least suggestion of immortality.³

The punishment of Cain for murdering Abel was to be that the earth should refuse to yield crops to his tillage.⁴ The wickedness of the antediluvians was so great that "it repented the Lord that He had made man on the earth, and it grieved Him at heart," yet there is no mention of any punishment after death.⁵ The sin of Ham was compensated by the condemnation of his descendants to slavery.⁶

When the law was delivered to Moses, with its promises and threats, its blessings and curses, there was no reference to future life. When the ancient Jew reached the grave, he had nothing more to hope or to fear. With death, good and evil came to an end for him. When publishing the ten commandments, Moses said to

the Hebrew people, "Ye shall walk in all the ways which the Lord your God hath commanded you, . . . that He may prolong your days in the land which ye shall possess."⁷ Again he said, "Honor thy father and thy mother that thy days may be long in the land."⁸ In the VIIth, VIIIth, and XXVIIIth chapters of Deuteronomy, very explicit statements are made of the blessings which the Hebrew nation should earn by faithful worship. Jehovah there promised to love and bless them; to give fertility to them and to their cattle without exception, and to their fruit trees and grain fields; to protect them against all sickness; and to aid them in utterly destroying the heathen occupants of the Promised Land. The blessings include many kinds of earthly prosperity, and the long list ends thus: "The Lord shall make thee plenteous in goods, in the fruit of thy body, and in the fruit of thy cattle, in the land which the Lord sware unto thy fathers to give thee." The evils threatened for disobedience are the sword, famine, pestilence, "madness, and blindness, and astonishment of heart," consumption, fever, inflammation, extreme burning, blasting, mildew, all the diseases of Egypt, trembling of heart, failing of eyes, sorrow of mind, renewed captivity; and "the Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation, and rebuke in all that thou settest thine hand to do until thou be destroyed."⁹ In all this there is not one suggestion of future retribution.

Nowhere in the Mosaic books is a future life promised or a belief in it mentioned; nor is one of its key words or phrases used. The great prophet never writes of immortality or eternal life; he never speaks of eternity connected with human life nor of heaven or hell as spheres of reward or punishment. Nor are those terms

used in other portions of the Old Testament. David, Solomon, Isaiah, and Job see nothing of human interest beyond the grave.¹⁰ The only distinct recognition of a future life in the Jewish sacred books is made by Daniel, who wrote after the Babylonian captivity, when the Jews had fallen under the Persian dominion and influence.

A dozen isolated passages, in scriptural Hebrew books of subordinate authority, may be forced by mistranslation and misinterpretation to convey the idea of a future life, but when balanced against the stronger evidences arrayed in this section, and many others that might be produced, they are entitled to little weight.¹¹

The belief in a life beyond the grave has certain natural accompaniments. These include the prominent and frequent use of such words and phrases as immortality, immortal life, eternal life, life everlasting, and the joys of heaven. They also include explanations of the different fates of pious and sinful souls in the other world. The Brahmin and Buddhist scriptures have much to say about transmigration; the Egyptian gospel gives long instructions to prepare the soul for defending itself in the supreme trial before Osiris; and the Christian has his last judgment, in which Jesus is to appear as the Redeemer, and Satan as the persecutor of mankind. The lack of these accompaniments of a belief in a future life and of everything equivalent or analogous to them in the Hebrew Scriptures is surely not accidental. Oversight is out of place in revelation.

After the return of the Jews from captivity and the re-establishment of a Jewish government in Jerusalem, the Pharisees, or teachers, who attached great value to tradition, accepted the doctrine of an eternal future life with rewards and punishments, but the Sadducees, including

the priests and high officials, continued to adhere to the Mosaic doctrine that death is an eternal sleep.¹² St. Paul said Jesus brought "immortality to light,"¹³ implying that it lacked recognition in the Hebrew Scriptures.

SEC. 341. *Jewish Morality.*—The morality of the ancient Jews was not superior to that of their time. Their sacred books command ecclesiastical persecution, witch burning, hereditary slavery, retaliation, ordeal, class privilege, aggressive war, despotic monarchy, and the divine right of kings. They give no protection against torture, mutilation, concubinage or polygyny. They provide no proper guaranty for the right of alien, slave, wife, or subject. They give no aid or comfort to the advocate of religious liberty or constitutional morality. They never rise to the conception of equal citizenship or self-respecting manhood.

The systematic and excessive glorification of David, continued through centuries without a dissenting voice, implies that their moral perceptions were not very delicate. He was their greatest national hero. He was blessed by their priests. He was commended by their Scriptures. His memory was cherished by the people. He was represented to be the author of the Psalms, the best book in the Bible. He was regarded as the special favorite of Jehovah. He was called "the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet Psalmist of Israel."¹ He was a frequent recipient of direct divine revelations. He was "a man after God's own heart."² Jehovah said of him that he did "that which is right in Mine eyes," and "he kept My commandments and My statutes; and he did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord . . . save only in the matter of Uriah."³ Addressing Himself to David near the close of his life Jehovah said,

"I was with thee whithersoever thou wentest, and have cut off all thine enemies out of thy sight, and have made thee a great name. . . . And thine house and thy kingdom shall be established forever."⁴

The story of David is told more fully than that of any other ancient Hebrew in the Bible. As we read his actions there recorded, we find that his career is remarkable for the multitude, the magnitude, and the variety of his crimes; and also for the manner in which they are narrated, as if all save two were regarded by the prophets as entirely consistent with rare holiness of character. He rebelled against Saul, his king and father-in-law; he betrayed Achish, his benefactor and protector when he needed protection; he committed adultery with Bathsheba; he murdered her husband, Uriah, when he refused to become responsible for the adulterous child of his wife; he made a hypocritical pretense of lamentation for his victim; he repudiated his first wife when her political influence ceased to be valuable to him; he slaughtered her sons by a second husband, and her brothers; he perjured himself to Shimei; and he tortured his captives by sawing them in two, by dragging them to death under harrows, and by roasting them in brickkilns. And after all this is told, a song attributed to David is inserted in the Bible, and in it the singer says, "The Lord compensated me according to my righteousness, according to my cleanness in His eyesight."⁵ If David was so exceptionally righteous and clean, as compared with his subjects, what must they have been?

Some singular cases of vicarious punishment will assist us to comprehend the Jewish ideas of divine justice. When David seized the royal office, he spared the de-throned family, and by his mercy to them offended Je-

hovah, who punished the king by afflicting all Palestine with a famine which lasted three years. Finally the Lord was appeased by the execution of seven men, who were not accused of crime, but were heirs of Saul.⁶

By an irresistible impulse, Jehovah moved David to make a count of his subjects, then treated the census as a great sin, and sent word to the sinner by Gad, the prophet, that the punishment would be either a famine for seven years, an invasion that would drive him from Jerusalem, or a pestilence. David was told to take his choice, but he went no farther than to pray to be saved from the invader. Jehovah sent a pestilence that raged from Dan to Beersheba, and carried off 70,000 Hebrews.⁷

When Solomon became an idolater, Jehovah, still continuing His habit of direct communication, said unto the king: "Forasmuch . . . as thou hast not kept My covenant and My statutes, I will surely rend the kingdom from thee. . . . Notwithstanding, in thy day I will not do it, . . . but I will rend it out of the hand of thy son; . . . and the Lord stirred up an adversary unto Solomon, Hadad, the Edomite. . . . And the Lord stirred him up another adversary, Rezon. . . . And he was an adversary to Israel all the days of Solomon, . . . and reigned over Syria."⁸

Thus we are told that famine, pestilence, war, and national separation were the punishments inflicted on the children of Israel for the personal sins of David and Solomon, each of whom reigned for forty years. Such stories, accepted as divinely revealed, necessarily led the Jews to imagine that divine justice was very different from human justice, and that reason could not be trusted to question sacerdotal assertion.

The following passages in the Hebrew Scriptures are

not in the most authoritative places, nor are they in harmony with the general tenor of the Mosaic law:—

“What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God.”⁹
“Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. . . . The stranger that dwelleth with you shall be unto you as one born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself.”¹⁰

SEC. 342. *Woman's Wrongs*.—In all ages of the Hebrew government, before the captivity, polygyny was legal, and among the rich and powerful was customary. David had at least eight wives. Solomon had seven hundred. Abraham and Jacob had each two. No law prohibited and no prophet condemned the general usage in this respect.

In one passage we read that “therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh.”¹¹ This might be interpreted as a declaration that monogamy was established and polygyny prohibited by Jehovah, but the history of the Hebrews proves that no such ideas were attributed to the words by the people for whom they were written. In Deuteronomy express permission is given to the Jewish men to take several wives,² and the legality of polygyny is assumed in many passages. It was not limited to the kings or to any class.

Marriage was not a sacrament. The priest was not present to give it consecration. It was a mere civil contract, which could be dissolved by the husband at his pleasure, and could not be dissolved under any circumstances by the wife or by any judge at her request. Here is the clause in reference to divorce: “When a man hath taken a wife and married her, and it come to pass that she find no favor in his eyes, . . . then let him

write her a bill of divorcement, and give it in her hand, and send her out of his house.”³ That is a very simple method of procedure, but to the modern mind, it seems rather unfair to the wife. The Mosaic law gives a double portion of the estate of the deceased husband and father to the eldest son, and nothing to the widow or daughter. It deprives the widow of the guardianship of her own minor child.

The existence of slavery implies that of concubinage, and the two institutions existed together among the Hebrews from the time of Abraham to that of Hilkiah. Patriarchs, priests, and kings were permitted by law and custom to keep slave girls in their harems, and they did so. Solomon had three hundred concubines in addition to his seven hundred wives, and, notwithstanding his unequalled wisdom, was unable to find one character, that he respected, among them all.⁴

SEC. 343. *Slavery*.—Slavery is authorized in many passages of the Pentateuch, and it was extensively practised among the Hebrews, so long as they had the power to capture and to hold the people of neighboring nations. Moses attributed to Jehovah the following command: “Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen which are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover, of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy. . . . And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen forever.”¹ Hebrews might also be held in slavery for six years, but must then be liberated.² The master had the legal privilege of blinding his slave in one eye. Here is the provision on that point:

"If a man smite the eye of his servant, . . . that it perish, he shall let him go free for his eye's sake."³ The law in reference to mortal wounds inflicted by the master on the slave is thus expressed: "If a man smite his servant or his maid with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall surely be punished, notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished, for he is his money."⁴ It will be observed that a mortal wound, not fatal within twenty-four hours, is not punishable, and that no definite penalty is affixed to a blow immediately fatal.

SEC. 344. *Hatred of Aliens*.—The Jews were taught that it was right for them to attack, plunder, enslave, and exterminate heathen nations which had given no offense. Here are some of the words attributed to Jehovah: "When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be that all the people that is found therein shall be tributary to thee and they shall serve thee. And if it will make no peace with thee, then thou shalt besiege it, and when the Lord thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword; but the women and the little ones and the cattle and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself, and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies which the Lord thy God hath given thee."¹

That command related to the treatment of all the heathen nations which the Hebrews might see fit to attack, without the least provocation, save the Canaanites, in reference to whom the following passage laid down the law: "But of the cities of these people which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an inheritance thou

shalt leave alive nothing that breatheth. But thou shalt utterly destroy them.”² At another time He said: “Thou shalt consume all the people which the Lord thy God shall deliver thee. Thine eye shall have no pity on them.”³ And once more He said: “When the Lord thy God shall deliver them unto thee, thou shalt smite them and utterly destroy them. Thou shalt make no covenant with them nor shew mercy unto them.”⁴ Of a more cruel or barbarous military policy than this, there is no record in history.

Under the Mosaic law, the duties of the Hebrew to his people were not the same as to aliens. The Gentiles only might legally be kidnapped and sold into slavery by a pious Jew; the Gentiles only he might hold in perpetual slavery; to Gentiles only he might make usurious loans; and to Gentiles only he was not under obligation to return a pledge.⁵

When Jehovah had established His chosen people in Canaan after the previous inhabitants had been conquered and despoiled, He congratulated them thus: “I have given you a land for which ye did not labor, and cities which ye built not, and ye dwell in them. Of the vineyards and olive yards which ye planted not, do ye eat.”⁶ The Hebrews were repeatedly told that they were “a holy nation” and the exclusive favorites of the most powerful of the gods; and such a belief had a strong influence in gaining for them a widespread reputation among other nations of being enemies of the human race.

While the Gentiles generally were declared to be the rightful spoil of the Hebrews whenever opportunity should offer, the Ammonites, Moabites, and Amalekites were declared to be special objects of Jehovah’s aversion.

"An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord. . . . Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days forever."⁷ "The Lord will have war with Amalek from generation to generation."⁸ "Remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way, when ye were come forth out of Egypt. . . . Therefore it shall be that when the Lord thy God hath given thee rest from all thine enemies round about in the land which the Lord thy God hath given thee for an inheritance to possess it, that thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under the heaven. Thou shalt not forget it."⁹

SEC. 345. *Criminal Law*.—Private retaliation was legalized in these passages, "eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe."¹ "If a man cause a blemish in his neighbor, as he hath done, so it shall be done to him."² "The revenger of blood himself shall slay the murderer, when he meeteth him he shall slay him."³ As in other barbarous communities where the system of private retaliation prevailed, so, too, among the Jews, involuntary homicide or justifiable homicide committed in self-defense was punishable legally by blood revenge. If, however, the person who committed the homicide could reach one of the homicide asylums established in various parts of Judea, then the avenger could not execute retaliation until after a hearing before judges, who absolved the accused if he had slain the victim unintentionally or justifiably.

The Mosaic law provides that a charge of adultery brought against a Jewish wife shall be tried by ordeal. "The priest shall bring her near and set her before the Lord. And the priest shall take holy water in an

earthen vessel, and of the dust that is on the floor of the tabernacle, the priest shall take and put it into the water, and the priest shall set the woman before the Lord, and uncover the woman's head, and put the offering of the memorial in her hands, which is the jealousy offering; and the priest shall have in his hand the bitter water that causeth the curse; and the priest shall charge her by an oath and say unto the woman: 'If no man have lain with thee, and if thou hast not gone aside to uncleanness with another instead of thy husband, be thou free from this bitter water that causeth the curse, but if thou hast gone aside to another instead of thy husband, and if thou be defiled, and some man have lain with thee besides thine husband,' then the priest shall charge the woman with an oath of cursing, and the priest shall say unto the woman, 'The Lord make thee a curse and an oath among thy people, when the Lord doth make thy thigh to rot and thy belly to swell.' . . . And he shall cause the woman to drink the bitter water, . . . and . . . if she be defiled, and have done trespass against her husband, . . . her belly shall swell, and her thigh shall rot. . . . And if the woman be not defiled, but be clean, then she shall be free."⁴

Let us suppose that this ordeal was to be applied. The priest might be influenced by two main considerations, first, regard for his own sacerdotal influence, and, second, desire for substantial justice. Which would be the stronger would depend chiefly on his personal character. In many cases, they would appear in his mind to be harmonious. He would make inquiry, or have it made, to find out whether among her neighbors the accused was considered guilty or innocent, and if guilty, he would sprinkle such poison on the floor of the taber-

nacle, that when taken in the ordeal water, it should not only kill the woman, but cause those symptoms which are described in the law. This would be the ordinary method of procedure in ordeals of poison, whether administered in Judea, or in Congo. So long as the average character of man remains as it is, and remains subject to such influences as have controlled sacerdotal conduct in savage, barbarous, and civilized nations, so long the trial of crime by poison ordeal managed by priests will be regarded with suspicion by intelligent men.

SEC. 346. *Ecclesiastical Crimes.*—The sacerdotal authority was protected by many capital punishments. Thus the death penalty awaited him who imitated the oil used in anointing the priests or the special perfume selected for the altar of Jehovah; and him who broke the Sabbath; or who without consecration approached the altar; or who without belonging to the sacerdotal class claimed to have revelations in dreams; or who practised the profession of sorcerer; or who did “not hearken unto the priest;” or who did not afflict himself or pretend to be afflicted on atonement day; or who killed goat, sheep, or ox at a distance from the sanctuary; or who blasphemed the name of the Lord; or who enticed a Hebrew to serve other gods.¹ This makes a list of eleven capital ecclesiastical offenses. The thousands of witch executions in medieval and modern christendom were caused mainly by the Mosaic command, “Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live.”²

Moses pronounced an elaborate series of curses upon the Jews who should not worship Jehovah according to his commandments in Deuteronomy, and here are some of them: “Cursed shalt thou be in the city and cursed shalt thou be in the field. Cursed shall be thy basket

and thy store. Cursed shall be the fruit of thy body and the fruit of thy land, the increase of thy kine and the flocks of thy sheep. Cursed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out. The Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation and rebuke in all that thou settest thine hand unto for to do, until thou be destroyed. . . . The Lord shall smite thee with a consumption and with a fever, and with an inflammation, and with an extreme burning, and with the sword, and with blasting, and with mildew; and they shall pursue thee until thou perish. And the heaven that is above thee shall be brass, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron. . . . And the Lord will smite thee with the botch of Egypt, and with the emerods, and with the scab, and with the itch, whereof thou canst not be healed. And the Lord shall smite thee with madness and blindness, and astonishment of heart."³

SEC. 347. *Malignant Prophets.*—Referring to his enemy, David thus addressed Jehovah: "Set thou a wicked man over him, and let Satan stand at his right hand. When he shall be judged, let him be condemned, and let his prayer become sin. Let his days be few, and let another take his office. Let his children be fatherless, and his wife a widow. Let his children be continually vagabonds, and beg; let them seek their bread also out of their desolate places. Let the extortioner catch all that he hath; and let the strangers spoil his labor. Let there be none to extend mercy unto him, neither let there be any to favor his fatherless children."¹

This is the Psalmist's prayer against the Midianites, Amalekites, Moabites, and Ishmaelites: "O my God, make them like a wheel, as the stubble before the wind. As the fire burneth a wood, and as the flame setteth a

mountain on fire, so persecute them with Thy tempest, and make them afraid with Thy storm. . . . Let them be confounded and troubled forever; yea, let them be put to shame and perish.”² Elsewhere he says, “Pour out Thy wrath upon the heathen that have not known Thee, and upon the kingdoms that have not called upon Thy name.”³ This curse, it must be observed, is supposed to have been written many centuries before Jehovah had invited the heathen to worship Him.

Jeremiah prayed thus for the punishment of his enemies and their kin: “Deliver up their children to the famine, and pour out their blood by the force of the sword; and let their wives be bereaved of their children and be widows, and let their young men be put to death.”⁴

SEC. 348. *Originality*.—The Mosaic doctrines and ceremonies generally were not original with the Hebrews, but before the time of Abraham had been familiar to the Babylonians, Egyptians, Phoenicians, and other heathens with whom the residents of Palestine were brought into contact by martial and commercial expeditions.

The ideas that man was created pure, that an evil spirit corrupted him, and brought sin and evil into the world; that Jehovah selected the Hebrews to be His favorite nation, and the only possessors of His revealed law; that He selected one Hebrew family to have an exclusive hereditary right to the priesthood; that the Hebrews should worship their national Deity with the sacrifices of beasts, and as a reward for their pious fidelity should be blessed above all other nations,—not only were all these features of the Mosaic religion copied from the older heathen nations, but most of the points of the ritual, decoration and architecture of the Hebrew temple,

and of the dress, revenue, and discipline of the Hebrew priesthood were borrowed in like manner.

The heathens anticipated the children of Israel in giving the names El, Elohim, Jehovah (Yahveh, Yah, Yao, Jahu) Shaddai and Adonai to the Deity; in offering to Him the firstlings of their fields and flocks; in building altars for His worship; in reserving the blood for His nourishment; in selecting the best animals for sacrifice; in regarding the number seven (that of the planets) as sacred; in observing the seventh day as one of rest from labor; in giving the name of Sabbath to this day; in divination by means of lots or dice; in decorating the priest with a breast ornament called the Urim and Thummim; in having an ark as a highly sacred piece of ecclesiastical furniture; in supplying the ark with figures combining the head and body of a man with the wings of a bird;¹ in designating these figures as cherubs;² in practicing circumcision as a consecration to the divinity; in accepting dreams as divine communications; and in planning their temple with an open court, a covered hall, and a dark sanctuary. Even the common folk-lore is borrowed from the valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates. The myths of the creation, the deluge, and Potiphar's wife are merely new versions of stories long current in the older nations.³

The lack of originality in the doctrines of the Hebrew Scriptures and in the ceremonies of the Hebrew worship furnish conclusive proof that Judaism as a religion was a product of evolution. It is contrary to all our conceptions of an inspired gospel that it should be a patchwork of ideas and practices previously familiar to men in many countries. Things already known could not properly have a place in a revelation, or at least, they could not

make up nearly all its substance. The assertion that the Mosaic books were a repetition of previous communications made by Jehovah to Noah, Abraham, or other patriarchs before the exodus, is unsupported by evidence. The phraseology of the Pentateuch conveys the idea that the substance of the communications made to Moses was new to mankind. There is no suggestion of a repetition of a previous revelation, no mention of the distinction between truths already familiar and others then made known for the first time. The only important original idea in the Mosaic books, the soul's mortality, is one for which the believers in the divine origin of those books, claim no credit.

The greater part of Genesis is made up of two older documents which are known as Jehovistic and Elohistic, according to the names of God used in the Hebrew Bible. In the "authorized" English version, Elohim is translated God; Jehovah Elohim, the Lord God; and Jehovah, either Lord or Jehovah. This difference of divine names assists the scholar to trace the limits of the passages which give duplicate accounts of ancient myths.

Twice we are told how the world was created; twice how the deluge occurred; twice how Jehovah made a covenant with Noah; twice how Abraham was tempted; twice how he made a bargain with Abimelech; twice how Abraham's wife was appropriated; twice how Jacob saw Jehovah in a dream; twice how he went to Mesopotamia; twice how manna and quails were given to the Hebrews in the wilderness; and twice how the water flowed from Moses' rock. Even if these duplicate stories were in harmony as to their ideas with each other, as they are not, their difference of phraseology would show that they are different versions of the same legends.

SEC. 349. *Historical Inaccuracy.*—The Jewish Bible is seriously defective in its historical parts. Its account of creation is inconsistent with astronomy, geology, and zoology. It makes our globe the center of the universe, and limits its existence to seven thousand years or less. It tells us of a time when supernatural beings appeared visibly among men, conversed audibly with them, fought for them, and took mortal women for wives. It gives credence to miracles, divinely appointed omens, divine revelations in dreams, demoniacal possessions, and witches.

From beginning to end the chronology of the Jewish Bible is defective, and in many places conflicting. The account of the stay of Jacob and his descendants in Egypt is evidently legendary. It contains no material that enables us to connect it unmistakably with any reign, century, or dynasty of Egyptian history. It does not give the name of any monarch. It is not corroborated by any one of the almost innumerable Egyptian monuments or manuscripts.

Discrepancies are numerous. The books of Samuel and Kings give an account of the main events in Jewish history from the time of Samuel to that of Jehoiachin,—that is from about 1100 to 630 B. C., and the book of Chronicles gives a parallel story, but the two compositions vary in many of their statements, and are not pervaded by the same spirit. The Chronicles is a later work, and its author has evidently striven to magnify the influence and importance of the priesthood. The author of Samuel says Jehovah moved David to number Israel, and then treated his census as a great sin.¹ Chronicles says it was Satan that “provoked David to number Israel.”² According to Kings, Hiram made a present of

twenty measures of oil to Solomon, and according to Chronicles it was 20,000.³ A long list of such differences could be given, no one of much note, if considered separately, though all, when weighed together as parts of a work that is offered to us as divinely inspired, are very significant.

Anachronisms, which are a class of contradictions, are numerous. Thus the clean and unclean beasts are mentioned many centuries before the distinction between them was made; the tabernacle is spoken of before it was constructed, the Sabbath before it was established, and the priesthood of Jehovah as in existence when provision had not yet been made for its organization.

A well written law book has its ideas arranged in logical sequence. Each of its subjects is treated in its order, and exhausted before the chapter relating to it is closed. There is no conflict, no confusion, no repetition, no separation of things that belong together, and no conjunction of things that are incongruous. Such features, however, are not found in the Mosaic legislation, which is without parallel for its repetitions, contradictions, uncertainties, and other errors.

If we examine the legal portions of Exodus, for instance, we shall find a series of verses relating to ethics, another to criminal law, another to ecclesiastical discipline, another to ecclesiastical architecture, another to sacerdotal organization, and another to ecclesiastical discipline, with several of history intervening. Nearly all these subjects are treated again in Leviticus, and again in Numbers, and again in Deuteronomy, and nearly every book has some legal matter not only belonging exclusively to itself, but inconsistent with certain passages in the others.

SEC. 350. *Mosaic Authorship.*—The theory that one author wrote the books from Exodus to Deuteronomy, inclusive, abounds with improbabilities, each very serious if considered by itself, all, when considered together, amounting to absolute incredibility.

It is highly improbable that one man wrote both the thirteenth verse in the XXVIIth chapter of Genesis, in which Jehovah told Jacob that "I am Jehovah the God of Abraham," and the third verse of the VIth chapter of Exodus, in which He said to Moses, "By My name Jehovah was I not known to" Jacob. It is equally improbable that Moses wrote both the ninth verse of the XXIst chapter of Numbers and the XXth chapter of Exodus. The latter forbids the Hebrews to make "any graven image or any likeness of anything that is in the heavens above or is in the earth beneath;" and according to the former, Moses made a brazen serpent to cure his subjects of snake bites. It is hard to believe that any one man could have written both the XXth and the XXXIVth chapters of Exodus. The former gives an account of the delivery of the ten commandments as we now have them to Moses, and of his breaking the stones when he found the Hebrews worshiping the golden calf.¹ The latter tells how Jehovah wrote upon two other tables of stone the same commandments, and copies them word for word, but the decalogue thus copied is radically different from that previously given.² The second tables of stone, "the words of the covenant the ten commandments," relate entirely to matters of ceremony, and do not prohibit murder, adultery, perjury, theft, or covetousness.

It is not likely that a lawgiver, worthy of his office, with time to complete his work, would repeat and con-

tradict himself in numerous important points, as Moses did if he wrote the whole Pentateuch. He would not in one book give the priesthood to Levi, and in another to Aaron, nor consecrate the business of the butcher and also desecrate it, nor give the firstling heifer calves, ewe lambs, and she goats to the sacerdotal revenue, and exempt them from it. Neither would he, in many cases, take up the same branch of the same subject, in three different books, and in each treat the matter as if there were no other law relating to it, as the Pentateuch does in reference to the places of worship, the religious festivals, the priests, the tithes, the firstlings, and the emancipation of slaves.³

There is no satisfactory evidence that Moses wrote a line of the Bible. The passages in the Pentateuch purporting to record the events of his own time are mythical in their general character. They abound with miracles and incredible stories. They have no chronological precision, historical probability, or corroborative evidence. No inscription, no coin, no contemporaneous record gives credence to a sentence attributed to Moses.

But all the books of the law, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, claim Moses as their author. They purport to give revelations addressed to him for the Jews, and to be dictated or written by him. Deuteronomy begins thus, "These be the words which Moses spake unto the children of Israel," and near its close says, "Moses wrote this law and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi."⁴ As in these sentences, so in most others where the writer mentions himself, he does so in the third person, but he uses the first person when he says Jehovah spoke to him. His phrase on such occasions is, "The Lord said unto me."⁵

Leviticus begins with the words, "The Lord called unto Moses," and afterwards says, "The Lord spake unto Moses," on more than twenty different occasions. The last verse tells us that "these are the commandments which the Lord commanded Moses for the children of Israel in Mount Sinai." This book never imitates the phrase of Deuteronomy, "The Lord said unto me," and Deuteronomy nowhere has the Levitical phrase, "The Lord spake unto Moses."

The book of Numbers, or all that portion of it relating to the law, was evidently written by the author of Leviticus. It uses like terms, expresses similar ideas, begins and ends in the same manner. It closes with the words, "These are the commandments and the judgments which the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses unto the children of Israel in the plains of Moab."

SEC. 351. *A Natural Product.*—The question whether the Jewish Bible is of natural or supernatural origin, belongs to the domain of history, in which it occupies an important place for readers in Christian countries. It must be stated and solved by every author who, in the last decennium of the XIXth century, writes a comprehensive account of human progress. The general reader, for whom this work is designed, does not need a full statement of the evidences. The proofs given in this chapter show that the books of the law were written by different persons in different centuries; and they imply that the other Hebrew books, which are comments on and supplements to the law, were composed without supernatural inspiration. The general conclusion is that the Jewish Bible, as a whole, is a production of natural evolution.

The ancient Jews did not possess any peculiar holiness

or decided superiority in ethical precept or practice over many contemporaneous heathens. They never were the exclusive favorites of heaven by an unjust and insulting preference over other peoples. Their intolerance and national seclusion were the results of what they considered celestial enlightenment, and of what the spirit of this age regards as an ecclesiastical delusion. Their sacerdotal system shared the fate of others of its age and kind. The temple and priests of Jehovah have disappeared as completely as those of Osiris, Baal, Moloch, Chemosh, and Zeus. The pedigrees of David and of Aaron are lost forever. No son of the former will re-establish the throne of Jerusalem; no son of the latter will ever again offer sacrifice at an altar of Jehovah. The Jewish religion still exists and is older than Confucianism, which has a much larger number of adherents, and perhaps older than Zoroastrianism, which has a superiority over Judaism in the modern observance of its ancient rites. Humanity lives, and ecclesiastical organizations die.

CHAPTER XXI.

EARLY GREECE.

SECTION. 352. *Hellas*.—We now move from Judea to Greece, from Asia to Europe; from barbarism to civilization; from military mobs to well disciplined armies; from debasing despotism to ennobling liberty; from cruel autocracy to the equal political power of many; from a literature, largely ecclesiastical, to one almost exclusively secular; from rudimentary to highly developed architecture, sculpture and painting; from relative intellectual stagnation to great mental activity; from a condition of culture practically stationary to another marked by rapid advancement; and from national isolation to intimate and extensive international association.

While the Greeks were in the earlier stages of their political and intellectual development, and as yet had no foreign commerce, the western Asiatics already had a wide reaching traffic, and the Babylonians and Assyrians had organized considerable empires. But the commercial and political relations of these conquering and trading nations were not accompanied by an intellectual intimacy similar to that which resulted from the conquests of Alexander. Neither were the subjects of these states or of Persia brought together by bonds of sympathetic and educational influence like those that impressed the Greeks at Delphi, Olympia, or Athens.

Every savage tribe has traces of progress, and many barbarous nations supply us with interesting details about the manner, time, and place in which various important improvements in human life were developed; but such information as we can get about the introduction of the alphabet in Egypt or of printing in China is vague and disconnected when compared with that relating to the growth of polity, literature, and ornamental art in Greece. It is in Athens that we first obtain a clear view of the march of a comprehensive culture, with opportunities to observe step by step, and to trace numerous important effects to proximate and remote causes. An increased speed of progress, a higher literary development, a previously unapproached intellectual refinement, and a long series of original and great improvements in constitutional law, now appear as new features in the history of mankind.

Greece is interesting to us not only as the mother land of civilization, freedom, literature, and art, and the pioneer in the swifter march of progress, but also as the country where the Aryan blood first showed the great superiority of its intellectual and moral endowment, where it acquired a consciousness of its own worth, and where it indicated the pre-eminence that it was to give to Europe in the culture of the world.

Greece proper, including the Peloponnesus and the adjacent continental Hellenic states, had about the same area (17,000 square miles) as the present kingdom of Hellas, equal to a square about one hundred and thirty-miles each way, between the thirty-sixth and the thirty-ninth degrees of latitude. Its surface is intersected by numerous mountain ridges, some of which project as capes far into the sea. The country has been compared

to a hand reaching out from Europe towards Asia and Africa. With Asia a hundred miles distant to the eastward, Africa two hundred and fifty miles to the southward, and Italy as far to the westward, with a thousand inhabited islands in its vicinity, with the Black Sea stretching six hundred miles to the northeast, the Adriatic as far to the northwest, the Mediterranean nearly as far to the southeast and twice as far to the west, Greece had the best situation for maritime commerce in the basin of the Mediterranean, as it was in antiquity.

In most of the valleys the soil is only moderately fertile. The rainfall is not abundant. The streams are few, short, and small. The summers are long and hot, the winters short, and except in the more elevated places not severe, and yet cold enough in the valleys to cause great occasional discomfort.

SEC. 353. *The Hellenes*.—The ancient Greeks, or Hellenes as they called themselves, inhabited not only Greece proper, but all the islands of the eastern Mediterranean save Cyprus, part of which they held. They also occupied portions of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica, much of Southern Italy, the western and southern shores of Asia Minor, many points on the borders of the Black Sea, Massilia (now Marseilles), and Cyrene in Africa. Wherever the Greeks dwelt, there was Hellas. They were not so exclusively maritime in their mode of life or so littoral in their place of residence as the Phoenicians, and yet being far more numerous, and occupying many more islands and a far larger stretch of sea coast, it might fairly be claimed for them that they were the leading maritime and littoral people of antiquity.

The inhabitants of all Hellas may have numbered

15,000,000, of whom one-third, perhaps, were in Greece proper and the neighboring islands, and the other two-thirds elsewhere. This total population of 15,000,000, however, included slaves and free aliens not of Greek blood, and in many of the Greek states of Asia, Italy, and Sicily, these classes were very large. That part of Greece north of the Corinthian Gulf, was considered the original home of the nationality.

By their dialects the Greeks were divided into three main classes,—the Dorians, Æolians, and Ionians, who, according to tradition, were the descendants of Dorus and Æolus, sons, and Ion, grandson, of Hellen, the legendary progenitor of the whole nationality. The Dorians included the Cretans, Rhodians, Cyrenæans, most of the Italian and Sicilian Greeks, and all the Peloponnesians, save the Achæans. The Æolians were the Corinthians, the Greeks north of the Corinthian Gulf, the Lesbians, and some Hellenic communities on the shore of the Ægean near the Hellespont. The Ionians were the Athenians, the inhabitants of the Ægean Archipelago, some of the Greek colonies along the shores of Asia Minor, and of most of those on the Hellespont and Black Sea. The Achæans, though not strictly Ionians, were classed with them.

Besides the variations of their dialects, the three Greek races, as they were called, were also distinguished by differences in mental qualities and political and social institutions. The Ionians generally were a maritime people, giving much of their attention to fishery, commerce, and the manufacturing arts. They were quick in apprehension, lively in manner, artistic in their tastes, the leaders in literature, in the arts, and in democratic government. By their traffic they had been brought into

intimate relations with the Asiatics, and perhaps learned from them to keep their respectable women in ignorance and seclusion. Athens was the leading Ionian state.

The Æolians were rude and dull, and yet they included such eminent statesmen as Epaminondas, Pelopidas, and Timoleon, and such brilliant poets as Pindar and Sappho. The people of Bœotia, the leading Æolian state, were noted throughout Greece for the slowness and dullness of their intellects.

Two of the Dorian states, Sparta and Crete, were distinguished above all other portions of Greece by the great attention and prominence which they gave to military drill, and to certain affiliated institutions, including a frequent mess dinner for every citizen of military age, and compulsory instruction by the state in choral and gymnastic exercises to all girls as well as boys.

Notwithstanding the differences of their dialects, all who were recognized as Greeks could understand one another. The Greeks of Marseilles, Cyrene, Syracuse, Tarentum, Sinope, Rhodes, Athens, and Sparta could converse together intelligibly, and all believed that they descended from a common ancestor. Their worship of the same gods by the same general rites, and their community of blood, speech, customs, and ecclesiastical rites, were to them matters of great value. They considered themselves far superior to other peoples, whom they classed together as barbarians, which term meant for them people not Greek in blood or tongue, not elevated in morals and education, nor true in religion. In the Vth century B. C. the Thessalians, Macedonians, and Epirots were not recognized as Greeks, though all were of Aryan blood, and very near akin to the Ionians, Dorians, and Æolians.

Besides being a small country, Greece was divided

into a multitude of independent states, which, on the average, were ridiculously small as compared with modern nations, averaging less than thirty miles square to the state. Small as they were, they differed greatly in their political, military, industrial, and literary characteristics. Many were highly pugnacious, and nearly every year were involved in war with some neighbor. Their political and military struggles, their literary and artistic achievements, their strongly marked individuality, their intense public spirit, their quarrels about questions that still possess deep interest for mankind, their important contributions to constitutional law, and their successful defense of European civilization, while yet in its infancy, against the aggression of the adult Asiatic barbarism, render the ancient Greeks highly interesting for historical study—the most interesting of all those nationalities which have made their final exit from the stage of life. And it is doubtless for this reason that more learning and genius have been given to the history and culture of Greece than to those of any other country. Herodotus, Thucydides, Grote, Thirlwall, Curtius, Freeman, Felton, and Mahaffy are a wonderful series of authors, who have devoted much of their lives to the study of this one nationality.

SEC. 354. *Superior Polity*.—In the VIIth and VIIIth centuries B. C. the Greeks were superior in their political and military institutions to all other nations, and this superiority was the source of their subsequent pre-eminence in many other departments of culture. Their industry did not differ notably from that of their neighbors. As mariners and merchants they were inferior to the Phœnicians. As tillers of the soil and breeders of domestic animals, as miners and metallurgists, as workers in stone,

wood, and metal, as weavers and dyers, they did not excel the Lydians, Babylonians, or Egyptians. Neither did they surpass other nations in scientific knowledge or in religious conceptions. Their ecclesiastical system was not strongly marked by original dogmas nor by a strict sacerdotal organization. They had neither sacred book, nor a consolidated priesthood. But their forms of government and their military drill were original, meritorious, and highly influential. It was by the exclusive possession of constitutional freedom and of superior martial discipline that they gained wealth, confidence in themselves, and power over others; that they were enabled to establish and maintain numerous colonies on the near and remote shores of the *Ægean*, Mediterranean, and Black Seas; that they kept all their states and colonies in intimate social and commercial relations with one another; that they made their tongue the dominant language of literature, diplomacy, and trade for many centuries in western Asia, northwestern Africa, and southern Europe; and that they changed culture from a dominant character of national separation to one of international communication. In no other country shall we find a polity so original and so superior in its principles and in its influences to that of all other contemporaneous or antecedent nations.

The smallness of the average Greek state before the IVth century B. C. was the result of a combination of numerous circumstances, including the frequency of destructive warfare, the superiority of the means of defending walled towns to the means of taking them, the lack of military engines for battering down walls, the habit of limiting campaigns to a few months in the warmer seasons of the year, the want of standing armies and of a system

for paying soldiers, the small size of the valleys, the multitude and ruggedness of the mountain ridges, and the ignorance of any system of representation by which numerous cities could unite under one government with equal shares of political power.

SEC. 355. *Sacred Monarchy*.—In legendary Greece, as we know it through the Homeric poems, the country was divided into a multitude of small kingdoms, each ruled by a hereditary monarch who was the descendant, in some instances the son, of a god. He had a sacred character and ruled by divine right, but when too old or feeble to be the actual leader of his troops in war, he must abdicate or submit to be deposed, so that his more active son could take his place. He must do credit to his office by readiness and force of speech, and by courage and skill in war. He might be tyrannical and cruel, but he must not be cowardly or stupid. His power, though great, was not clearly defined, and so far as there was any limit, was restricted only by that of the nobles, each of whom was a military chieftain with absolute direct command over his own tenants and slaves.

The king dwelt in his capital, a fortified city, where he was judge in all civil and criminal lawsuits. He accepted presents from litigants to pay him for the trouble of deciding cases. He had his royal domains outside of the city, and there also he was the judge and ruler. There was no written law. His revenue consisted of presents from his subjects, and his shares of the produce of his lands, of the plunder taken in war, and of animals offered in sacrifice. He levied no taxes on the land, income, or traffic of his subjects.

Besides being the military and political chief and supreme judge of the kingdom, the monarch was also its

chief priest. On all occasions when the state was to be represented by its superior sacerdotal dignitary, he officiated. He conducted the sacrifice, he offered the prayer, and he declared the meaning of the auguries. He had ecclesiastical subordinates, who recited the formulas of expiation, who sang the traditional hymns, who served as custodians of the temples, and who assisted in the sacrifices, always under his direction.

The noble had his home in the city and his estate of land in the country. His tenants were mostly slaves, and, like the king, his chief occupation was war. It was his duty to lead his free tenants in the field, and their absolute allegiance was due to him. Within the bounds of his estate he had supreme power as civil and criminal judge, lawgiver, and ruler. Before any question of importance in the government was decided, he had a right to hear the subject discussed in a council of nobles, and to be heard before a policy was adopted by the monarch.

The majority of the people were slaves, a large minority were freemen, and of these, all the adult males were required in time of war to serve in the army. When military expeditions were undertaken, or when peace or war was declared, the soldiers were brought together in a popular assembly, which was addressed by the monarch and perhaps by some of the nobles. The applause given to the speakers indicated the drift of public opinion, which exerted a strong influence on the decision. The commoners had no right to speak and no chance to participate in a formal vote.

After such an assemblage, the action of the king was supposed to be in accordance with the wish of his nobles and subject freemen, who, by the expression of their opinion, had relieved him from exclusive responsibility

for any disaster that might be incurred in a policy approved by all before it was finally adopted. Thus, at the earliest discoverable stage of Greek life, we find systematic public meetings, political oratory, and an influential public opinion.

The slaves were persons captured in war, and their descendants. Their condition was considered but little lower than that of poor freemen. Most of them were employed as domestic servants, and were treated with indulgence by their masters, to whom they were strongly attached, and whom they often accompanied in war. They were allowed to marry, and their unions were considered as sacred as those of poor freemen. They were rarely sold.

War was the chief occupation and delight of the nobles, and much of their wealth was in their arms and armor. The helmet, breastplate, and greave, the shield and sword and javelin, were necessary to the noble; the poor freeman had no defensive armor and might fight with bow and sling. The great nobles had war chariots. There was no cavalry. Neither were there any well disciplined bodies of troops, such as were numerous in historic Greece. The battles seem to have been disorderly skirmishes, in which every chief fought at the head of his subjects, his superior armor and weapons giving him great advantage over those with inferior equipment. When two such warriors met, each tried to scare the other by threats and by boasts of his great exploits. The fury of their rage was accompanied by an equal excess in their exultation after victory, and in the expression of their mortified vanity after defeat. When disappointed or humiliated, they wept like children.

SEC. 356. *Greek Aristocracy*.—Before we reach the

historical period of Greece—and that period can be traced back indistinctly to the IXth century B. C.—the hereditary “Zeus-begotten, Zeus-sustained” kings of divine ancestry possessing dominant sacerdotal and political powers, had all disappeared to make way for aristocracies. Why the monarchies of divine right came to an end we do not know; probably it was because, in the course of centuries, every dynasty died out, or its inheritance fell into the hands of a man obviously unfit for his place, or its nobles felt the urgent want of a political system in which they could participate with equal power.

The government which succeeded the sacred monarchy in Greece was in every case an aristocracy. In no city did a democracy rise immediately on the overthrow of the monarchy, and in few cases did a usurper follow the hereditary king of divine lineage. The nobles who had been the companions of the sacred sovereign, seized his power and shared it among themselves.

Sparta and several other aristocratic states enacted a law of primogeniture to prevent the partition of land belonging to nobles, and another of entail to prevent its alienation to outsiders, but checks of this kind could not prevent families from dying out, and therefore could not maintain the original number of estates. Most of the Greek aristocracies, however, did not adopt these checks, and in the course of several centuries many of the noble families had ceased to be rich, and of those which retained their ancestral domains undiminished, some were surpassed in wealth by commoners, who had engaged successfully in commerce and manufactures. On the other hand, some nobles were greatly enriched by the growth of towns and by the opening of quarries or mines in their lands.

So long as the aristocratic government was maintained, so long the nobles, no matter how poor they might be absolutely or relatively, were proud of their nobility and of their share in the political power. They considered themselves a superior race. They had a domestic worship, and commoners had none, or none that the nobles recognized as worthy of respect. They shared the communion of the gods of their country, and other men did not. Their blood was sacred. They could not contract a legitimate marriage out of their order. Their wedding was a divine institution. The commoner might be rich and prosperous in many ways, but he was vulgar and profane. It would be sacrilegious to admit him to a priesthood, to a marriage with a noble, to a high office, or to a feast of the city officials at a communion of the local divinity. If the commoner had capacity for accumulating money in trade, or if he had obtained wealth by inheritance, he did not thereby gain a right to a voice in political affairs. Traffic and manual labor were demoralizing occupations, devotion to which was considered inconsistent with the public service. As a class, the nobles never consented willingly to admit commoners to a share in the government.

In every Greek aristocracy, the nobility formed a considerable proportion of the people, at least a twentieth, perhaps in some cities a fifth of the whole population. In no prominent city was the nobility a squad of twenty, fifty, or one hundred men. It was never an oligarchy, such as we find imposed in later times by the conquerors on some subjugated states.¹

SEC. 357. *Constitutionalism.*—The nobility exercised its dominant political power through a council, in which every nobleman, after reaching a certain age,—twenty-

one, twenty-five, or thirty years in different cities,—had a right to hear and vote, but not invariably to speak. The meeting was held in the market place, the officers sitting on a platform under shelter, while the multitude stood under the open sky. When a vote was taken, the majority was ascertained either by loudness of acclaim, a show of hands, or a division. Executive officers had authority to state the questions, which must then be decided without amendment.

But rude as were their methods of procedure, the councils of the Greek aristocracies had an educating influence. Here political oratory had a field for its exercise, here public opinion was built up, and here men learned to require statements of the reasons for political measures. Both sides were entitled to an orderly hearing before a decision was rendered. The political and military officers were required to account to the council for the manner in which they had performed their duties. A sense of responsibility to the community was established. Judicial power was intrusted to courts with open sessions, an orderly method of procedure, a hearing for both litigants and written laws. Thus were built up a conception of popular rights and a constitutional morality without their parallels among barbarous nations.

The public spirit of the Greek aristocracy was well expressed by the Lesbian Alcæus, whose poem, "The State," was paraphrased by Sir William Jones, a citizen of the greatest modern aristocracy. The following lines from it, familiar as they may be, will never lose their interest:

"What constitutes a state?
Not high raised battlement or labored mound,
Thick wall or moated gate;
Not cities proud, with spires and turrets crowned,

Not bays and broad-armed ports,
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Not starred and spangled courts,
Where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride.
No—men, high-minded men,
With powers as far above dull brutes endued
In forest, brake, or den,
As beasts excel cold rocks and brambles rude,—
Men who their duties know,
But know their rights, and, knowing, dare maintain,
Prevent the long-aimed blow,
And crush the tyrant while they rend the chain,—
These constitute a state.
And sovereign law, that state's collected will,
O'er thrones and globes elate
Sits empress, crowning good, repressing ill.”

The establishment of the Greek aristocracies indicates “an important advance,—the first adoption of a deliberate and preconceived system in the management of public affairs,” the first recognition of a community of citizens with equal rights, “qualified and thinking themselves qualified to take turns in command and obedience.”¹ The Phœnician governments are described so vaguely that though earlier in time than the Greek aristocracies, we must look to the latter for our conceptions of the manner in which the arbitrary power of one man gave way to government by a deliberating council.

The first written laws of Greece were enacted in aristocratic states. About 650 b. c. the Locrians in Sicily applied to Delphi for advice in regard to their government, and they were instructed to get a shepherd to give them laws. Zaleucus, a shepherd in their territory, asserted that he had a divine revelation ordering him to be

the lawgiver of his countrymen. They accepted his statement and adopted his laws. He provided that estates of the nobles in land must be subject to a perpetual entail, so that their wealth should not be diminished. The control of the administration was intrusted to a council or assembly of a thousand members. This constitution,—the provisions of which, except those here mentioned, are unknown to us,—was maintained in Locri for two hundred years, and was adopted also in Croton and Sybaris. A written system of laws, similar to that of Zaleucus, was prepared about 640 b. c. by Charondas for Catania in Sicily, and after acceptance there, was also adopted in half a dozen cities of Italy and Sicily, each having a ruling council of about a thousand men. Whether these thousand were the richest men we do not know. In Colophon, Asia Minor, the political power was given to a thousand men selected on account of superior wealth, and to their successors by inheritance.

SEC. 358. *Small States*.—It was in the time of their early aristocracies that the Greeks accepted the idea that the state should not be larger than the city and the dependent territory which could be reached from it in one day. The word city (*polis*) became synonymous with state and nation, and from it were derived such terms as polity, police, and polish, as in Latin from the city (*civitas*) are derived citizen, civilization, and civility.

The average Greek citizen was extremely jealous of his political privileges. He was unwilling to divide them with others, or to do anything that would much diminish his share of power. He did not wish any great increase in the number of citizens. He liked conquest, but never demanded annexation. He had great ambition to augment the military power of his country, but not by

admitting the residents of other cities to an equal share in its government. The Greek had an ecclesiastical motive for disliking annexation. His native state had a patron divinity whom he could not desert without offense. The bounds of citizenship were not often extended, but when they were, the men newly admitted were usually subject freemen or freedmen, natives of the country, not born under the allegiance of a foreign god. The lack of a system of representation, the political jealousy, and the ecclesiastical exclusiveness combined to render the aristocratic and democratic Greek states incapable of expanding and building up an extensive dominion on a durable basis.

Rule by deputy was not unknown to the ancient Greeks, for they practiced it in the amphicyonic council of Delphi, but this body was rather ecclesiastical than political. They did not consider the idea valuable for ordinary government. No Greek statesman advocated or discussed its merits. The only mention of it in Greek books is incidental. Doubtless, if it had been proposed, the people, especially those of the poor class, would have rejected and resented any proposition to take from them the direct control over questions which they had been accustomed to decide, questions which involved their fortune, freedom, and life. Many questions that might involve the prosperity or independence of a nation, cannot be understood except by those who have made special studies of national economy, and of national and international law, and therefore could never be properly intrusted for decision to an assembly of whom a large proportion were uneducated, and without time or taste for study, and besides without the knowledge and judgment required to protect themselves against the mis-

representations of fact, the sophistries and the appeals to prejudice, customary among demagogical orators. But such considerations as these never induced a Greek popular assembly to transfer its powers to representatives.

Even after familiarity with Persia and Macedon had furnished an abundance of evidence that the isolated Greek cities could never be secure of their independence, the highly learned and able political philosopher Aristotle was so much controlled by the hereditary ideas of his country that he said a state must necessarily be small in its area. According to him, when 100,000 men had an equal share in a government, the country ceased to be a state, and became a nationality fit only for the rule of a despot.¹

The participation of the Greek aristocrat in the government and army of his city under the political and religious ideas of his country, made him intensely patriotic. He and the state were brought into the most intimate association and mutual dependence. If war was declared, an alliance formed, a peace made, an expedition sent out, a battle fought, a victory won, a defeat suffered, a tax levied, or a constitutional amendment adopted, he had a share in the responsibility. He was one of a few hundreds or thousands who formed the ruling assembly and the army. If he was a man of more than ordinary ability, he must almost inevitably be clothed at some time with important office. Without the courage, fidelity, and discipline of himself and his friends, the city could not exist, and without its protection life would have no value for him. Except under rare circumstances, he could not elsewhere acquire citizenship, nor have a sacred marriage, nor have a domestic worship or a share in the religious rites of a clan or a city. If exiled, he

would be cut off from the most sacred relations of life. His city was indispensable to him in many ways, but in his conception it was a political, not a geographical, entity. Its essence was the nobility to which he belonged. The domination of his order was more precious to him than the independence or prosperity of the state.

Sec. 359. Military Service.—The frequency of war, one of the most prominent and influential factors in Greek life, was the result of the great number of small states, their jealousy of one another, the multitude of political revolutions, with the alternating ascendancy of rival factions, the impossibility of preventing borderers from crossing state lines for plunder, and the prevalent opinion that occasional hostilities were needed to keep up the discipline and martial spirit of the troops. A long peace was unknown in the past, and was not expected in the future.

Wars were not only frequent, but they were very earnest. Every man who had a share in the government must also be a soldier, and be ready to risk his life. The wars were more destructive than those of modern times, not only because they were more frequent and a larger proportion of combatants died on the field, but also because the proportion of combatants to the total population was larger.

Military service was far more trying to the courage of the soldier in ancient than in modern armies. The time of his exposure in battle was briefer, but the danger was much greater. If in the front rank where the attack was made, he was within reach of the spear and sword of the foe, whose furious looks and movements he saw, and to whom or from whom he must give or take a fatal thrust.

Defeat often brought exile, slavery, or death to all the

citizens. When Messenia was conquered by the Spartans, all her captured freemen were slaughtered or enslaved. When the army of Sybaris was crushed by that of Crotona, the surviving Sybarites were sold into bondage and their city destroyed. Mycenæ, Tanagra, Thespiae and Platæa were razed by their victorious enemies. When Athens was taken at the end of the Peloponnesian war, the Thebans wanted to level it to the ground. The Athenians had previously banished, enslaved, or slain all the people of Scio, Melos, Ægina, and a considerable part of Eubœa. Poverty, exile, and bondage as well as death, were constantly staring at the Greek soldier.

While campaigning, the noble soldier was usually accompanied by a trusted slave, who, besides giving personal attendance to his master, served as a light armed soldier, and in emergencies took a place in the heavy infantry. As a class, the slaves in the armies were faithful to their masters, and not unfrequently they fought well. It never was the policy of any Greek state to encourage a slave rebellion in another state, even when the bitterest hostility prevailed.

We must imagine the nobles as originally the conquerors of the country, the lands of which they divided among themselves. The vanquished inhabitants were reduced to slavery. There were a few landless freemen, dependents and companions of the commanding officers, but nearly the whole population consisted of nobles and slaves. Gradually the proportion of commoners increased by the arrival of countrymen of the conquerors, either soldiers or laborers, by the immigration of alien traders, and by the emancipation of slaves.

The nobles considered themselves the nation, and for a

time they composed its army. They held the political power, and they must defend it. Their title to a share in the government was based on their service in its establishment and its maintenance. A man not ready to fight was not fit to rule. Equal in political rights, they were also equal in military duty. They elected their commander, who designated his subordinates; and thus public opinion controlled the army. They were a minority of the population, and they must always be on guard against the insurrection of slaves or subject free-men, as well as against foreign invasion. They must devote themselves to arms. Each had his suit of defensive armor which was so costly that in the early ages none save nobles could afford the expense. Their armor, their arms, their leisure, their habit of exercising in the use of their weapons, their frequent participation in campaigns, and their association with one another in the political assembly, contributed to that eminent tactical efficiency which had never been equaled before and was never surpassed afterwards.

SEC. 360. *Thorough Drill*.—The Greek nobles were the first to perceive the value of thorough military drill; and the first to make an extensive application of its principles. They made their infantry, armed with the spear, the chief department of their army, and required them to fight in close order, relying for victory mainly on their charge. The chariot was discarded as fit only for barbarians. Cavalry, bowmen, and slingers were used as auxiliaries and subordinates. The bow and the sling being unfit for close contact or for exact drill, were weapons for slaves and light armed troops. The archers, slingers, and cavalry of the Greeks were inferior to those of many Asiatic nations, but their heavy infantry had a vast su-

periority. A body of five thousand Greeks could confidently assail five times as many Persians, Egyptians, Babylonians, or Syrians, and cut a way through them in any direction.

The drill and efficiency of the Greek aristocrats were based on their governmental system. They must prove their nobility and right to dominion by valor in meeting their enemies and by fidelity in sustaining their friends. Their social pride and political interests were powerful stimulants in the face of danger. Cowardice meant disgrace, if not slavery or death. There was no such motive to impel the Persian or Babylonian to fight stubbornly. He was one of a vast multitude who had been trained, in a negligent way, to fight with long range weapons and to depend for success mainly on numbers. His political condition as an obscure subject of a despotic empire, furnished him with no motives of pride in the state, no sense of much personal responsibility. In the Vth and VIth centuries b. c. Persia, by the magnitude of its army, was the most formidable of military powers; and yet the Greek, comparing himself with the Persian soldier, could not fail to perceive his own superiority and to gain much of that self-confidence which is of vast importance to military efficiency.

The main lessons taught and practiced in Greek discipline were, that the soldier should be thoroughly familiar with his drill and with the idea that death is preferable to cowardice; that the advancing enemy must always be met with unbroken ranks, face to face; that every man must fight so as not to expose the person of his companion on either side of him; that all gaps must be closed promptly; that every man must know his precise place in every contingency; that the shield should never be

thrown away; that, no matter what the apparent danger, there must be no disorderly flight, nor easy slaughter for the victor; and that if death seemed certain, it should be awaited with composure, and with the determination to make the enemy pay for it dearly. These were the main principles of drill for all heavy armed infantry in the aristocratic, as well as in the later democratic, Greek states.

The best troops in Greece were those of the aristocratic states, especially those of Sparta, which were far superior to all others. In that city more time was given to drill than elsewhere, and more effort was made to maintain the spirit of the camp in ordinary life. Neither as fighters nor as marchers were the Spartans ever equaled. The self-sacrifice of Leonidas, and the march from Sparta to Marathon just in time to be too late—a hundred and fifty miles in three days—stand in history without their parallels. Next to the Spartans as soldiers were the Thebans, who owed their excellence to aristocratic teaching. The Athenians won victories more brilliant than any in the records of Sparta or Thebes; but they owed their triumphs less to superior drill than to excellence of strategy and to the intelligence, enterprise, and intense patriotism of their soldiery.

Thorough drill, close order, and reliance on the spear and the charge, introduced by the Greek aristocracy and carried by them to a development never surpassed, were practiced by Themistocles, Pericles, Epaminondas, Alexander, and by modern Europeans until long after the introduction of gunpowder into general use. The troops which understood them best were almost invariably victorious.

The characteristic weapon of the hoplite was a spear with a shaft of ash about nine feet long and a head of

steel a foot long. Not unfrequently he carried two spears, one to throw and the other to keep in his hand for the charge. He also had a short sword or long dagger not to be used until, in consequence of closeness of contact or for some other reason, the spear was no longer available. The shield, two feet wide and four long, was to protect the face, neck, body, and thigh, the leg below the knee being covered by the greave. The breastplate, to furnish additional protection to the chest, was of metal or of leather with strips of metal. A helmet of steel or bronze covered the head, and in some cases part of the face. The hoplites furnished their own arms, armor, and provisions, and served without pay. Those who were wealthy had slaves to carry their armor when marching at a distance from an enemy.

In modern times the bayonet succeeded the spear and was handled on similar principles, with similar results. At the critical time of the battle, the bayonet charge was the favorite movement with the best generals from 1600 till 1850; but the drill with firearms was never so thorough as that with spears. Opposing troops rarely crossed bayonets. Nearly always the soldiers on one side ran before the cold steel reached them. Never in modern warfare has there been a stubborn hand-to-hand conflict, much less an actual pushing of a battalion out of place by mere momentum, as often occurred in Greek and Roman warfare. Repeating rifles of long range have reduced the bayonet, close order, and the general principles of Greek drill to relative insignificance for the warfare of the future.

The fate of the Greek battle was usually decided by the conduct of the three or four ranks in front; and the observation of this fact led to the adoption of the rule

that under ordinary circumstances the files should be eight deep, so that a battalion of eight hundred men had a front of one hundred. The four foremost ranks would probably determine the result but they needed several others behind them to give them confidence, fill gaps, and attend to emergencies. It was important to have the line as long as possible for the purposes of attacking, and preventing attack, in flank. Short range weapons and defensive armor were adapted only for meeting an enemy in front; and with them there was far less facility of turning about to face a charge from the side than in modern warfare. Some of the most notable victories of the Greeks were won at one end or both ends of the line. The superior general allowed or encouraged the enemy to push their middle division forward, and then, assailing them in flank, threw them into helpless confusion.

SEC. 361. *Lycurgus*.—The leading aristocratic state of Greece was Laconia, called also Lacedæmon and Sparta, the last the name of its capital city. It was remarkable for the great influence which it exerted on other states; for having the most military of all constitutions; and for the long period through which it maintained its government without violent change, while surrounded by nations that went through many revolutions.

Laconia without Messenia, which was its subject province through three centuries, had an area of about twenty-five hundred square miles, equivalent to fifty miles each way, in the southeastern corner of the Grecian peninsula. It included many rugged mountains and several fertile valleys, but neither good harbor nor considerable seaport town. It was fenced off by mountains on the north and the west, and on the south and east

was bounded by the sea. By its poverty, as well as by its surroundings, it was protected against invasion, and under that protection, developed and preserved its singular institutions.

Against the extreme insecurity of property, freedom and life in early Greece, Lycurgus undertook to protect Sparta. He gave to its dominant class a military system that enabled them to defy any enemy then within their reach. He sacrificed everything else to martial efficiency. His citizens were cut off from every ambition save such as was necessarily connected with the life of a soldier. They could not become merchants, manufacturers, scholars, authors, artists, or genteel idlers. They were not permitted to travel in foreign countries, nor to admit many foreigners into their country. They had little opportunity to acquire foreign tastes or to learn foreign fashions. They could not dwell in elegant houses nor eat luxurious viands. Their life at home and in peace was similar to that while at war, amidst formidable enemies. The spirit of the camp accompanied them and governed them everywhere from the sixth to the sixtieth year.

Lycurgus had no ambition beyond that of protecting Sparta against overthrow by foreign or domestic enemies. He did not aspire to make them rich or learned or refined. He did not hope to lay the foundation of a large empire, nor to establish a state that should exercise much influence on the political institutions of neighboring countries, nor to frame a government that would develop free institutions. Having traveled without finding permanence or security anywhere, he felt that he ought to be content if he could obtain these blessings for his country.¹

In his project of establishing a military state always ready and competent to defend itself against any enemy known to him, Lycurgus was greatly aided by the geographical position and character of his country. It offered little plunder to invaders, and besides was in a remote corner of a mountainous peninsula garrisoned by a large military force which must be passed before Sparta could be reached.

After setting aside several considerable tracts for the revenue of the state, and others for the kings, Lycurgus divided the remainder of the land of Laconia into 39,000 farms, of which he gave nine thousand to as many noble families, and 30,000 to commoner families. The estates of the nobles were subjected to entail and primogeniture, so that they could not be divided nor taken from the chief male heir in the direct line of descent; and it was only the male proprietor of one of these tracts who was a noble, with a full share in the government. His younger brothers and their sons lived in his house, shared his military training, and perhaps fought by his side in war, and after his death, in case he left no son or grandson in the male line, had a chance to inherit his property and noble privilege. The nobles could not increase, and in consequence of their frequent wars they steadily decreased in number.

Lycurgus devised a government wonderfully original in its plan and successful in its purpose. He provided that the Spartans should not undertake more than they could accomplish. He made the scope of his constitution narrow, so that its methods should be effective. And when tested by time they proved successful. In the midst of the most severe trials, including the intense agitation of active political progress in the adjacent

states, of almost constant warfare with energetic and powerful enemies and of a largely preponderant number of discontented Helots, Sparta remained for five centuries without serious modification in its laws, without violent change in its rulers, without the occupation of its capital city by an alien enemy, and without a general insurrection of its bondsmen or subject freemen. Other law-givers did far more to develop the freedom, the intelligence, the commerce, the wealth, and the extended dominion of their people, but no other did so much for the permanence of political institutions and of inherited possessions.

SEC. 362. *Spartan Army.*—The Spartan constitution organized and maintained the best of all armies, by keeping every male citizen—that is, every noble; commoners were not citizens—in strict and severe training from his sixth to his sixtieth year; by making him familiar with privation, hardship and danger; by preventing him from adopting any habits, from acquiring any interests, and from being subjected to any domestic influences that would interfere with the highest military efficiency; and finally by surrounding him with a public opinion that would render life worthless to him if he were not a good soldier.

So soon as a boy was born, the state, by its officials, decided whether he could reasonably be expected to become a valuable citizen. If puny or deformed, he was exposed to die. At the age of six, he was taken from his mother and put into what may be called a camp. His food, his clothing, and his conduct were under the supervision of the state. He was drilled daily in gymnastics, in rhythmical movements, and in certain rude chants, which were considered valuable stimulants to the

martial spirit. He was taught to run, to jump, to throw the javelin, to wrestle, to box, and to steal. His clothing was the same in summer and in winter, and he often suffered with the extremes of cold and of heat. He was fed on coarse food, so scantily and with such little variety that he must often go hungry or find his meal very unpalatable unless he could add something to it by thieving, which was commendable, if managed without discovery, but was visited with disgrace and physical punishment when detected. At a festival he was subjected, at least once in his life, to a public beating with tough switches so severe that death was sometimes the result, and if he made any outcry or even flinched, he was disgraced.

He was not permitted to follow nor even to learn any industrial occupation. He must not till the soil, much less devote himself to the more dishonorable mechanical labor and traffic. He must not possess any coin unless of iron, but he might have gold and silver in the form of bars. The only tools to be used in shaping the wood-work of his dwelling were the axe and the saw. It was his duty to keep himself free from foreign influences; he must not marry an alien woman, he must not even sing an alien air.

The life of his home should approximate that of the camp. He must devote a large part of his time every day between his fifteenth and his fortieth year to military and gymnastic exercises. He must participate in two daily drills of his squad or company; he must know exactly what to do if his squad commander, or his comrade on either side, or the one before or behind him, or any or all of his squad or company, were slain or disabled. He was taught that he must never run from the enemy, nor,

unless expressly authorized by his commander, must he break ranks to plunder a defeated foe. He was trained to preserve his coolness in every emergency, and to consider death as welcome in preference to a violation of the established discipline. After his commander had selected a place for battle, he must never leave it except as a victor. This last was a general rule, but was doubtless subject to some conditions which have not been transmitted to us with satisfactory clearness.

Such strict subordination of the citizen to the state, and such thoroughness of drill, were never enforced in any other country, nor were any other soldiers ever equal to the Spartans. No others had a better combination of the physical and mental qualities required for military service; no others gave such strict and long-continued attention to discipline; and no others were compelled by the irresistible pressure of public opinion to conform themselves so strictly to military regulations. The soldier of Athens or Rome who threw away his shield and ran at his highest speed from the battle field might afterwards live at home in a certain kind of comfort. Though despised by the community at large, he would have the pity, sympathy, and protection of his family and their intimate friends. They would make allowance for the fact that some men are so constituted that they cannot composedly face the near approach of violent death by a sword already dripping with the blood of friends. But in Sparta there was no such indulgence. The father, the brother, and even the mother cursed the man whose cowardice was a discredit and a danger to the state. For him there was no welcome, no respect, no peace, no satisfaction. He was an outcast. Life was made intolerable for him. And not for him alone, but

also for the man who, after fighting bravely so long as resistance could avail, afterwards, in violation of the regulations or of the commands of his superior, saved his life, with the intention of risking it again whenever he could reasonably hope to do effective service to his country. Sparta did not allow the soldier to use his judgment in such matters. He must submit himself to the established rule.

For the purpose of keeping the fighting temper up to the highest pitch, Lycurgus not only required the Spartans of military age to attend two drills daily, but also to take their dinners in public messes of men of their own class, where they could neither have dainty dishes nor dangerous supplies of wine. The mess numbered fifteen men, and no person could be admitted without consent of all its old members. To this each contributed about twenty gallons of barley meal, six gallons of wine, four pounds each of pork, cheese, and dried figs, and forty cents in coin monthly. Messmates were allowed to bring in game which they had killed, and probably several other kinds of food might be contributed. The table of the mess was, however, very simple, and an Athenian who tried it, said he did not wonder that the Spartans were always ready to die. The chief dish was called black broth, made of barley meal, flavored with pork or pig's blood.

There is no better indication of the military spirit of the Spartan people than the manner in which the mothers treated their soldier sons. When a young man complained to his mother that his sword was too short, she said to him, "Add a step to it." Another, when giving his shield to her son about starting upon his first campaign, said, "Return with it or upon it." The soldier slain

honorable was brought home on his shield. After a Spartan regiment of six hundred men had been slain by Iphicrates, the fathers, brothers, and sons of the dead "strutted about publicly [in Sparta] with cheerful and triumphant countenances, like victorious athletes."¹

The self-sacrifice of Leonidas and his band is, and promises to remain forever, unequaled in any other nation, the legitimate result, the most glorious outgrowth, of the Spartan constitution. When the allied Greek army found that the pass of Thermopylæ could no longer be successfully defended against the Persians, they retreated, but Leonidas, the Spartan king in command, decided that he would remain and die, and he selected three hundred of his nobles to share his fate, and with them remained several thousand Helots, and eleven hundred Thebans and Thespians. The Spartans were not one-tenth of the little army which devoted itself to death, but they were its heart and soul, and they are often spoken of as if only they deserved mention. Not one of the Spartans present in the battle fled, sued for mercy, or survived, and, so far as is known, their Thespian and Helot companions all shared their fate. The Thebans sought and obtained mercy.

It so happened that Aristodemus, one of the three hundred Spartans selected by Leonidas, did not participate in the battle. Conflicting accounts are given of the reason for his absence. One says he was sick, and another that he had been sent away on an errand and could not return until after the Greeks had been surrounded by the Persians. It was known that he was one of the band appointed to die and that he continued to live, and those facts were sufficient to disgrace him at Sparta. His life was made so miserable that he demanded a posi-

tion at Platæa, where an honorable death would be certain, and he obtained it. The self-sacrifice of Aristodemus supplements and completes that of Leonidas.

In five centuries, the greater part of which time was spent in war, no Spartan army was captured, driven into hasty flight, or disgracefully defeated, and very seldom was one successfully resisted, unless by a considerably larger force, under superior generalship. In 425 B. C., the seventh year of the Peloponnesian war, and more than three centuries after the establishment of the political system of Lycurgus, and after the military features of that system had been made familiar to the other Greeks, in numerous wars, a detachment of four hundred and twenty Lacedæmonian soldiers took possession of the islet of Sphacteria to prevent the Athenians from using it as a landing-place for their fleet. This islet, near the western shore of Laconia, was separated from the Peloponnesus by a narrow channel, probably not more than two hundred yards wide, but wide enough to give the Athenians an opportunity to use their maritime skill effectively in cutting off regular communication with the mainland, and thus besieging the Lacedæmonians, who had a very scanty supply of food, no fortification, no tools or mortar for building walls, no timber, and only one spring of fresh water.

The Athenian ships kept going up and down constantly day and night, on the watch for boats and swimmers, but could not prevent a few of the latter from reaching the islet in dark nights with little packages of provisions. The Athenians landed 10,000 men, brave, enterprising, and skillful, under an excellent commander, and yet, with more than twenty to one, they failed day after day, to capture or destroy the little hostile force,

until their Messenian allies got possession of a cliff overlooking the camp of the Lacedæmonians, who then surrendered.

The prisoners numbered two hundred and ninety-two—more than one in four of the original detachment having been slain. Among the captives were one hundred and twenty Spartans, and these, it may be said, were the only ones that counted. When the news of their surrender reached the cities of Greece, the astonishment, as Grote says, was “prodigious and universal.” It was the first time that so many Spartans had ever been taken alive in one body; indeed, it is the only time in hundreds of years of war that so many together ever did surrender. It was said, “The Lacedæmonians die but never surrender;” and this appeared to the Greeks not a mere boast, but an inviolable principle. The exultation in Athens and the depression in Sparta were equal to the astonishment in Corinth and Thebes. So humiliated, so discouraged, and so anxious were the Spartans to recover their one hundred and twenty captive citizens, that they who had before spurned the Athenian solicitations, themselves now begged for peace.

Near Corinth, in 390 b. c., a mora, or regiment of Spartan hoplites, was surrounded in an open plain by a much larger force of Athenian peltasts, who fought at long range with bows, slings, and javelins; and fled whenever the Spartans tried to come to close quarters. The hoplites suffered much loss and could inflict none in return; and would all have been cut off if a detachment of Spartan cavalry had not come to their assistance and aided their retreat. Out of the six hundred, four hundred were slain. Not one was taken prisoner; not one sued for mercy.

SEC. 363. *Spartan Government*.—The government was managed by the assembly, the senate, the ministry, and the kings. The assembly consisted of all the male nobles thirty years of age who had not forfeited their political privileges. It met in the market-place of Sparta, once a month regularly, and at other times if convened by order of the ministers. A king presided and submitted questions for decision, or, when occasion required, requested the nobles to elect senators or ministers. If a vote was to be taken on a resolution, no amendment or substitute was permitted. The assembly must adopt or reject in the form in which the question was proposed. Neither could the members generally make speeches nor motions; they were there to say aye or no and nothing more. The ministers, kings, sons of kings, and those whom a minister or king might request to argue the matter, and none others, could address the meeting. When the vote was taken, if the outcry was not plainly decisive, the voters were requested to divide, so that the numbers on each side could be seen and, if necessary, counted. In electing senators, all the candidates came forward successively, and the loudest outcry, as determined by a committee, who could not see the candidates, conferred the office. The assembly was the supreme authority in the state; it alone could declare war, make peace, enter into treaties of alliance, liberate any considerable number of Helots, elect ministers and senators, or decide disputed claims to the crown. It was not encouraged to hold long sessions, nor supplied with seats to make a long session comfortable, nor did it provide long orations to entertain the attendants. The rule was that the speeches must be few and very short. As the law and public opinion required that the noble should punc-

tually perform all political duties, we may presume that there was usually a full attendance at the assembly.

The senate had thirty members of whom two were the hereditary kings, and twenty-eight were nobles, at least sixty years of age, elected for life by the assembly. It was the duty of the senate to serve as an advisory council for the ministry, to try political and capital crimes, and to prepare business for the assembly. The senior king was the presiding officer.

The ministers, or ephors, five in number, were elected annually. They supervised all branches of the administration, managed the foreign and domestic affairs, controlled the size, the destination, and the command of the armies, and not unfrequently two of them accompanied a commanding king as his advisers. They could suspend any official, even a king, and bring him to trial before the senate. They convened the assembly, submitted questions to it, and had the privilege of addressing it. They were judges in courts of civil jurisdiction. The main responsibility of the government rested upon them; they gave vigor and efficiency to the administration. The brevity of their term, their desire to be re-elected, their liability to criminal prosecution at the end of the year for any misconduct, their obligation to consult the senate at every important move, the necessity of confronting the assembly of nobles every month and of guarding themselves against the jealousy of the kings, were securities that they would not endeavor to overthrow the constitution. And they never did. More than once they were its chief guardians against the treasonable designs of the kings. Under their rule the Spartans preserved a remarkable harmony. There was no division of the ruling class into two nearly equal fac-

tions more hostile to each other than to alien enemies, like the aristocratic and democratic factions of Corinth and many other Greek cities. This internal harmony of the Spartans is to be credited largely to the influence of the ministry.

The Spartan administration of justice was highly partial. The nobles had superior judicial as well as political privileges. They were seldom punished for any assault on a commoner, Helot, or alien, unless it endangered the public peace; and complaints of persons of the subordinate classes were in many cases not even considered. So long as a Spartan commander of a garrison in a subject city did not provoke a dangerous rebellion, the ephors did not call him to account for his crimes committed at the expense of the aliens under his control.

A Spartan noble could not be condemned to death without a trial, though it might be very brief, but persons of other classes were often executed without a formal accusation, by order of an ephor. Dorieus, a Rhodian, happening to be in Laconia when his city withdrew from the Spartan confederacy to unite with that of Athens, was executed because of his nationality, though there was no reason to believe that he had the least part in the action of Rhodes. On a former occasion this same Dorieus forfeited his life to Athens, and was taken before the Athenians to receive his sentence of death, but he was a distinguished athlete who had shed lustre on the Greek name by his victories at the Olympic and other international games, and the assembly granted him life and liberty.

Two kings, or priest-generals, each the head of a royal family, were the only hereditary officials in Sparta. With very little political power, they often exerted great

influence over the administration by means of their life-tenure, their hereditary character, their authority to interpret the auguries for national enterprises, and the almost absolute power which they held when in command beyond the limits of Laconia.

The duplicate royalty of Sparta, like the later duplicate consulship of Rome, was the remnant of a monarchy which had been deprived by the nobles, of its political power (though permitted to continue in the exercise of its sacerdotal and military authority), and hampered by the division of its functions between two hereditary officials, each the rival and counterpoise of the other.

In the military history of Greece, many of the Spartan kings were prominent figures, not because they were great generals but because they were at the head of great armies. Most of them were dull, commonplace men. As a commander not one of them was equal to their countrymen Brasidas; nor among them was there one that approached Themistocles, Pericles, Epaminondas, Pelopidas, or Timoleon in fertility of genius or admirable qualities of character. Though not one of them combined greatness in generalship with greatness in oratory and statesmanship, yet half a dozen of them made themselves infamous by treasonable designs against the constitution of their country, and by malignant hatred of the free institutions of other Greek states. Many acts of petty meanness towards other cities were committed by the Spartan kings, who were demoralized by the imaginary importance of their hereditary dignity.

SEC. 364. *Helots*.—Grote tells us that “it was a part of the institutions of Lycurgus (according to a statement which Plutarch professes to have borrowed from Aris-

tote) that the ephors should every year declare war against the Helots in order that the murder of them might be rendered innocent; and that active young Spartans should be armed with daggers and sent about Laconia, in order that they might, either in solitude or at night, assassinate such of the Helots as were considered formidable. This last measure passes by the name of Crypteia, yet we find some difficulty in determining to what extent it was ever realized." And again he says: "Sparta, even at the maximum of her power, was more than once endangered by the reality, and always beset with the apprehension, of Helotic revolt. To prevent or suppress it, the ephors submitted to insert express stipulations for aid in their treaties with Athens,—to invite Athenian troops into the heart of Laconia,—and to practice combinations of cunning and atrocity which even yet stand without a parallel in the long list of precautions for fortifying unjust dominion. It was in the eighth year of the Peloponnesian war, after the Helots had been called upon for signal military efforts in various ways, and when the Athenians and Messenians were in possession of Pylus, that the ephors felt especially apprehensive of an outbreak. Anxious to single out the most forward and daring Helots, as the men from whom they had most to dread, they issued a proclamation that every member of that class who had rendered distinguished services should make his claims known at Sparta, promising liberty to the most deserving. A large number of Helots came forward to claim the boon; not less than two thousand of them were approved, formally manumitted, and led in solemn procession round the temples, with garlands on their heads, as an inauguration to their coming life of freedom. But .

the treacherous garland only marked them out for the sacrifice; every man of them forthwith disappeared,—the manner of their death was an untold mystery.”¹

Notwithstanding such occasional severe treatment of the Helots, they were generally submissive and faithful servants, and were not only trusted at home, but were trained as light armed soldiers to accompany their masters in foreign campaigns. At Plataea they were a large majority of the Laconian army, and at Thermopylæ more than two thousand of them died with their masters, the most remarkable instance of servile devotion on record. The Thebans begged for mercy; the Laconian Helots did not. In no other army were the serfs so numerous as in that of Sparta, and in their many campaigns in Attica, Boeotia, Argos, Corinth, and Asia Minor, never once did the Helots go over to the enemy. The inference is that the custom of their country made bondage light for the great majority of them.

SEC. 365. *Spartan Policy.*—In the VIIth century B. C. the Spartans adopted and enforced the policy of prohibiting the maintenance of despotic government in any Dorian state of the Peloponnesus.¹ Their motive was not love of liberty but hatred of the political power that supported the despot. They considered the nobles as their natural allies, and the enemies of the nobles as enemies of Sparta. To expel a despot and restore an aristocracy to power was a method of extending their influence and securing allies.

But in those places where they could not maintain an aristocracy strong enough to be of service to them, they were always ready to establish a despot or an oligarchy. After the close of the Peloponnesian war, when they were at the height of their power, they had an excellent oppor-

tunity to show their feelings in reference to the government of allied and subject cities; and they established a little oligarchy, composed of ten men, in every Greek city of the Aegean islands and of Asia Minor. These decemvirs selected for subservience to Sparta were everywhere tyrannical and unpopular, and they contributed much to make the subject cities long for the restoration of the milder Athenian dominion. The Spartans were unjust towards their stronger as well as their weaker allies. After the close of the Peloponnesian war, Lysander had about \$500,000 in coin contributed by Cyrus to aid in crushing Athens. This money and the booty taken in the war, belonged to all the states which had conducted the war in alliance; but Sparta kept all for herself.

It might have been supposed that men bred in a discipline so severe, accustomed to diet and clothing so simple, and taught with so much care to devote all their energy and ambition to the art of war, would, when they triumphed in foreign lands, abstain from the rapacity and arrogance common among conquerors never subjected to such training. But as a matter of fact, the Spartan kings and other commanders were the most arrogant, rapacious and corrupt of the Greek conquerors. As a class they brought detestation on themselves and on their country. They were lustful and venal. Pausanias, who held the main command at Platæa as regent, and Lysander, who inflicted the final and crushing defeat on Athens in the Peloponnesian war, both adopted Persian manners, and undertook to betray their country to Persia. These are the basest treasons in Grecian history; crimes unapproached by any high official of Athens, Boeotia, or Corinth. King Pleistyonax was convicted of receiving foreign bribes and driven into exile. Cleandri-

das was executed, and Thimbron and Pasippidas were banished for treason, all generals. Cleonymus, heir to the throne, was excluded from it, and then offered to aid Epirus in conquering his country. Astyochus, Anaxibius, Aristarchus and Gylippus, Spartan generals, were corrupt, and in addition Aristarchus was basely treacherous. Phoebidas, a Spartan general, was fined by the ephors for his seizure of the fortress of Thebes, a friendly city, but they kept possession of the stronghold. In this list the offenses of king Pausanias, executed for treason, and of King Cleonymus, who assassinated the ephors in 226 b. c., are not counted, because the former was condemned unjustly, and the latter did what he believed would be a benefit to his country.

In the multitude and baseness of these crimes by high officials, this list is unparalleled in any other Greek state, and the evidences against the accused are strong in every case. The guilt of regent Pausanias and of Ly-sander is proved beyond a doubt. The Spartan courts which were not inconsiderate and irresponsible mobs, condemned them all. In Athens, the greatest political crimes were committed by the mob-like juries, in Sparta by kings, generals, and ephors.

The maintenance of the constitution without notable change and the preservation of domestic peace for five centuries appear the more remarkable after we have observed the decrease in the number of the governing class. The long and fierce wars in which Sparta was involved, her numerous sanguinary battles, the gradual exhaustion of wealth, the extinction of many families and the impoverishment of others, reduced the noble rulers from nine thousand in the time of Lycurgus to one thousand in the time of Aristotle and to one-third of that number

in the following century. Meantime, the number of commoners and slaves remained about the same in Laconia proper, from which its province of Messenia was liberated in the time of Epaminondas, after having been subject to Sparta for three centuries.

Of the domestic history of Sparta we know very little. From the time when the political institutions of Lycurgus were adopted, about the middle of the IXth till the IIIrd century, b. c., the constitution was preserved without notable change. During the last two centuries of its existence, it was greatly hampered by the influence of the Macedonian empire, but it continued to control the internal affairs of the country. The greatest disasters led to no revolution. One of the nearest approaches to a change in the constitution was the adoption by the assembly of a resolution that the nobles who had retreated from the field of Leuctra, should not be dishonored or disfranchised. That such a resolution should be necessary to save the credit of an army which had fought with desperate courage and owed its defeat entirely to the superior generalship of Epaminondas, is one of the best evidences of the unequaled martial spirit of the Spartans.

The Spartans succeeded in training themselves into an army of unequaled discipline, but that was the whole extent of their success. They originated no political idea of value to other nations; they rendered the continuous improvement of their descendants impossible; they fettered education and art; they contributed no great poem, oration, history, statue, or temple to the wealth of the world. They produced no great statesman of the first rank like Themistocles, Pericles, or Epaminondas; no man of sublime moral character like Aristides, Socrates, Epaminondas, or Timoleon. They knew how to die, but

not how to live. Their training made magnificent brutes, but odious men. Felton says that "their constitution was an outrage on human nature."

It has been said in praise of Sparta that she did not ostracize her leading statesmen. But she did not educate such men at home. "She produced, at most, four eminent men,—Brasidas, Gylippus, Lysander, and Agesilaus. Of these, not one rose to distinction within her jurisdiction. It was only when they escaped from the region within which the influence of aristocracy withered everything good and noble, it was only when they ceased to be Lacedæmonians, that they became great men. Brasidas, among the cities of Thrace, was strictly a democratic leader, the favorite minister and general of the people. The same may be said of Gylippus at Syracuse. Lysander in the Hellespont, and Agesilaus in Asia, were liberated for a time from the hateful restraints imposed by the constitution of Lycurgus. Both acquired fame abroad, and both returned to be watched and depressed at home. . . . The Spartans purchased for their government a prolongation of its existence by the sacrifice of happiness at home and dignity abroad. They cringed to the powerful; they trampled on the weak; they massacred their Helots; they betrayed their allies; they contrived to be a day too late for the battle of Marathon; they attempted to avoid the battle of Salamis; they suffered the Athenians, to whom they owed their lives and liberties, to be a second time driven from their country by the Persians, that they might finish their own fortifications on the Isthmus; they attempted to take advantage of the distress to which exertions in their cause had reduced their preservers, in order to

make them their slaves; they strove to prevent those who had abandoned their walls to defend them, from rebuilding them to defend themselves; they commenced the Peloponnesian war in violation of their engagements with Athens; they abandoned it in violation of their engagements with their allies; they gave up to the sword whole cities which had placed themselves under their protection; they bartered for advantages confined to themselves, the interest, the freedom, and the lives of those who had served them most faithfully; they took, with equal complacency and equal infamy, the stripes of Elis and the bribes of Persia; they never showed either resentment or gratitude; they abstained from no injury and they revenged none.”²

SEC. 366. *Greek Despots*.—The VIIIth century b. c. witnessed a great decline in the social influence and military preponderance of the nobility in Greece, a necessary result of the development of trade and the rise of the middle class. Many of the nobles had become poor, and many of their free subjects rich. Among the hoplites there were more commoners than aristocrats. Most of the men who maintained the state on the battlefield resented their exclusion from a share in its government. With the increase in their number, wealth, and military value, the commoners rose in their estimate of themselves. They were irritated by the class tyranny and insulting social exclusiveness to which their fathers had submitted as if of divine authority. They demanded the rights of sharing in the government, intermarrying with the nobles, and communing with the city gods. The aristocrats treated their demands with scorn, and the commoners stored up their wrath until chance offered relief from the detested oppression. The opportunity was often made by some discontented and ambitious noble,

who declared himself the friend of the commoners, and with their aid overthrew the aristocracy and established a despotism on its ruins. He favored the multitude to whom he owed his place; he taxed, if he did not plunder and decimate, the nobility who were his enemies, usually scheming for his overthrow. In no Greek city did the nobles, as a class, become the declared adherents of a despot, though there were states in which they ceased to offer any active opposition. It was reported that when a young Greek despot sent to an older one for advice in the art of government, the latter led the messenger into the garden where there were poppies in bloom, and with a switch cut off all the tallest heads. That was his reply.

Even when the commoners detested a despot, they preferred his rule to that of the nobility. He claimed to be their friend. He did not insult them. The victims of his spoliation and outrage were almost invariably the nobles. He began his career by flattering the rabble. In express terms or by implication he promised to protect the poor against the rich. This, says Aristotle, was "the course of Pisistratus in Athens, of Theagenes in Megara, and of Dionysius in Syracuse."¹ There were cities in which the despots slew many nobles, and divided their property among the commoners, who would then of course make the most bitter resistance to the restoration of the aristocracy.

The usurper never united the sacerdotal with the political headship. A man previously at the head of the city worship never seized the despotic power; and the priesthood could not be seized violently. Public opinion would not tolerate usurpation in that direction. The hereditary priests of the city continued to perform their sacerdotal duties under the despotism as before its estab-

lishment, but usually, as they were nobles, without any special devotion to the despot. Having no priestly office, his person was not sacred, and his son had no recognized right of succession. Nor did any dynasty of despots hold its place for as long as two centuries in any Greek state.

Many cities submitted to despots either before or after, or both before and after, bitter struggles between the nobility and the commonalty for the control of the government. The earliest despot to gain a prominent position in Greece was Cypselus, who, in 655 b. c., became master of Corinth, which was the first Greek community to acquire an extensive commerce, and the first to build up a wealthy middle class, impatient of the rule of old nobility. His power was transmitted to his son Periander, a man of such repute for wisdom that he was counted as one of the seven wise men of his nationality. Under his rule, Corinth acquired a political power greater than it ever held before or after his time. Its dominion was then acknowledged by Corcyra, Ægina, Epidaurus, Ambracia, Lucas, and Anactorium. Soon after the son of Periander succeeded to the throne, the nobles re-established the aristocracy, and in the subsequent confusion the subject states established their independence. They never returned to their old subjection. The dynasty of Orthagoras reigned over Sicyon for a hundred years, and the city never was more prosperous or powerful. Its most famous ruler was Cleisthenes, the grandfather of the distinguished Athenian statesman of the same name. Pittacus of Mitylene was one of the most amiable of despots. He was distinguished for "a probity superior to the lures of ambition," and for "a conscious moderation, during the period of his dictatorship, which

left him without fear as a private citizen afterwards."² Polycrates, of Samos, was a very famous and powerful man in his time (he died in 522 b. c.), so powerful that the Persian emperor could find no better way to master him than by treacherously luring him away from his city. Under his rule Samos reached its highest prosperity. In the last quarter of the VIIth century b. c. Theagenes was despot of Megara, which then was more powerful than ever before or afterwards. Some of the Sicilian cities had despots distinguished for their literary and artistic tastes, as well as for great wealth and military power. When the preponderance of Macedon became a continuous menace to the isolated Greek cities; when the want of some kind of federal union was felt more keenly than ever before; and when the Achæan league offered an acceptable nucleus, several despots whose names will be mentioned hereafter, resigned their power to advance the interests of their respective cities and of Greece.

Considered as a class, the despots of the Hellenic nationality were remarkable for ability of administration and generosity to partisan enemies. They stimulated the arts, beautified and enriched their cities, extended their dominion, and treated submissive subjects with liberality. They did much to cure the nobles of exclusiveness and insolence; and to teach them to fraternize with the commoners, without whose aid there was little hope of overthrowing the despotism. This subjugation of the nobility was an important step in the political education of the Greeks. It prepared the way for democracy, as the aristocracy had prepared the way for a liberal despotism.

CHAPTER XXII.

ATHENS.

SECTION 367. *Theseus and Draco*.—In the regular course of its development, the polity of the Greeks began with hereditary monarchy, advanced to aristocracy, and ended with democracy. All their states passed through the first two of these stages, some never reached the last. The usurping despotism, which, in many cities, separated aristocracy from democracy, had a beneficial influence in breaking down the line of separation between nobles and commoners; and it should perhaps be counted as the third of the main steps in Greek political progress.

In tracing this growth, we find its best exemplification in Athens, which, after passing through the three earlier stages, originated democracy, carried it to the highest development known to antiquity, illustrated it with the most splendid achievements in many departments of life, and preserved the best record of the manner in which its reforms were adopted. In these respects, Athens is pre-eminent among Hellenic cities, so far above all others that she stands out in conspicuous solitude. For several centuries, her political history was the history of polity.

Of the 500,000 inhabitants of Attica, in its most prosperous period, about 200,000 resided in Athens; and the remainder were nearly equally divided between the sea-port towns (Peiræus and Munychia) and the rural dis-

tricts. The seaports were five miles distant from the capital, and their inhabitants, mostly sailors and laborers, included a considerable proportion of thrifless and homeless freemen, who, by their distance from the capital, as well as by their occupations, were prevented from habitually attending the meetings of the assembly, and from having much political influence.

According to local tradition, there was a time when Attica consisted of twelve independent states, each under its own petty chief or king. When Theseus was the sovereign of Athens, he brought all these chiefs under his dominion, and transferred them from their little capitals or citadels to Athens, where he made them nobles; if they preferred to remain in their old homes or to return to them for permanent residence, he allowed them to preserve their citizenship in Athens, and to enjoy all its rights as if they dwelt within the city walls. This was a liberality unknown to any other Greek city, the universal rule elsewhere being that the man who dwelt beyond the walls of the city had no share in its government. Theseus gave to the people of Attica an equality of political right that contributed much to the subsequent power of the state. He also welcomed to Athens numerous political exiles from other parts of Greece, and admitted them to citizenship, with a liberality unexampled elsewhere. "With them," says Grote, "the city acquired an abundance of noble forces and a variety of forms of religion, which were hereditary in the different houses. From this period dates the many-sidedness of Hellenic culture, the attention to foreign customs and inventions, the desire of acquiring knowledge and experience, and of domesticating at home every progress of Hellenic civilization."

Freeman considers this consolidation of Attica by Theseus as "the beginning of the political history of mankind." He says: "Whether this great event was owing to force or to persuasion, to some happy accident or to long-sighted political wisdom,—whether we see in it the gradual result of predisposing causes, or attribute it to the single genius of some nameless statesman of an unrecorded age,—in any case it stands forth as one of the foremost events in the history of the world."¹

At that time the government of Athens was similar to that depicted in Homer. There was a king without definite limit to his power; under him a class of wealthy and influential nobles whom the king sought to conciliate; beneath them were the commoners, peasants, and artisans; and the lowest class were slaves. The nobles were divided into three hundred and sixty clans, each of which had its common clan name, common descent in the male line, common worship, common sepulchral rites, and mutual obligations of defense and vengeance. The commoners and slaves had no worship and no domestic gods.

In the late period of the monarchy, one of the kings proved incompetent to lead his army, and the nobles in their council (which met on the Hill of Mars, or Areopagus, and was therefore called by that name) elected a polemarch, or general, who held his office for life and became a rival of the monarch in power.

The last king was Codrus, who, about the middle of the XIth century B. C., sacrificed himself in a heroic manner to save his country. Tradition says that because of his exalted merit, no other person was considered worthy to succeed him, and therefore his office was abolished; but another story says his sons quarreled among themselves about the succession. Whatever the cause of the

change in the form of government, an aristocracy was established. The political head of the government, called an archon, elected for life from the descendants of Codrus, exercised great power under the supervision of the Areopagus. In 752 b. c., after the archonship had been held for life through nearly three centuries, its tenure was reduced to ten years; in 714 b. c. all nobles were declared eligible to it; and in 683 b. c. its duties were divided among ten archons who were elected annually. The first archon was the political chief; the second was the priest of the state; the third was the polemarch, or military commander; and the other seven were their ministry. After the close of their annual terms, the archons became members of the council of Areopagus for life; and this body had general supervision of the administration, army, and finances; and was also the high court of the state. Its organization and jurisdiction were copied in the Roman Senate. Like the latter, it was devised to include nearly all those men who had held the highest executive offices of state by popular election, and who by their experience were most worthy of being intrusted with the charge of the government. We may presume that questions of peace and war and the elections of archons were left to the assembly of nobles.

About 621 b. c., under circumstances of which no account has been preserved, Draco reformed the constitution. He overthrew the old nobility, and established a new one based on money. He conferred exclusive citizenship on those freemen, natives of Attica, who had a full suit of armor. He restricted the political power to those who served in the cavalry or heavy armed infantry, and who provided their own military equipment. He provided that the state should be ruled by those who

sustained it on the battle-field. No one could hold office until he was thirty years old; nor could anyone be archon unless he had property to the amount of \$180; nor general unless he had \$1,800. The citizens were divided into three classes; first, those who had an annual income equivalent to seven hundred bushels of barley; second, those of four hundred bushels; and third, those of two hundred and fifty bushels. The freemen whose income was less than two hundred and thirty bushels were considered unable to provide themselves with heavy armor, and were subjects, not citizens.

The nobles met occasionally in an assembly, which presumably elected archons, polemarchs, and treasurers, and decided questions of peace and war. Those who failed to attend were fined in amounts which varied for the three classes. Aristotle tells us that Draco established a senate of four hundred members, but says nothing of its functions. By his silence on that point, he justifies a suspicion that his report of the existence of such a body under Draco, is incorrect. There does not seem to have been any room for a senate until the Areopagus was deprived of its legislative and administrative authority.

SEC. 368. *Solon*.—The constitution of Draco did not establish harmony among the people. It satisfied neither the rich nor the poor. It did not disturb the old law of enslavement for debt, which offended public opinion. It irritated the nobles, who owned most of the land and exacted as rent five-sixths of the crop from the poor tenants. The result was a civil war, which suggested the need of a political reform. At this time the most prominent citizen of Athens was Solon, then about sixty years of age, a man of middle social station, but of eminent reputation for eloquence, knowledge, and integrity. He

had been a successful merchant and in that capacity had seen many foreign lands, and observed the institutions of many nations. He was also a distinguished poet, and could write so effectively that, after his countrymen had decided to give up their claim to Salamis, from which they had been driven by Megara, his verses impelled them to make another effort in defense of their rights. Then, dropping the business of poet for that of military commander, he led the Athenians in war and regained Salamis. Such talent and such services, combined with his wealth, and his repute for knowledge and integrity, pointed him out to his fellow-citizens as the one man competent to save his country.

To many persons it seemed that the best remedy for the prevalent political evils would be the establishment of a despotism; and Solon had the popularity, the genius, the courage, the integrity, and tact that would probably have made it successful and beneficent. Many of his friends urged him to assume despotic power, and when he refused, lamented what they called his folly and madness. His refusal, doubtless, added greatly to his influence with the nobles, and induced them to accept him as their law-giver, though otherwise they would probably have made strenuous objections. This was in 590 B. C.

Solon had a project, great far beyond his perception of its value, the idea of a democratic government, in which every freeman should have equal political rights, and should have an equal opportunity and stimulus to educate himself to the fullest development of his natural capacity. He could not carry out this idea in his system of constitutional reform, among a people bred under the influence of ignorance and class oppression, but he might give it a start on the field of human life. And

this is what he did. He established a democracy in Athens, the first in time, the most brilliant in history. The political power which he found in the exclusive possession of the nobles, he communicated to the free-men. He abolished nobility as a political institution, though he allowed it to remain as a social institution. He created the popular assembly, or mass meeting of the citizens, and transferred to it the legislative power, the supervision of the administration, the control of the finances, and the exclusive authority to declare war and to make peace.

He maintained the classification of citizens made by Draco on the basis of income; and admitted only men of the first class to the positions of polemarch, treasurer, and archion. Men of the second class could hold office, save the three highest, and must serve in the army and in the cavalry, providing their own horses if so required. Men of the third class could hold subordinate offices and must serve as hoplites or heavy armed infantry, and provide their own arms and armor. Men of the fourth class were disqualified for office, and must serve in war as light armed troops.

SEC. 369. *Athenian Assembly.*—Solon's most important measure was the establishment of the popular assembly, to which he gave exclusive control of peace, war, legislation, finance, and general administration. In this body, which was the most prominent feature of the government, until the final overthrow of the Athenian democracy, every citizen had an equal vote. To it every official owed obedience; and to it he was directly or indirectly responsible for the proper performance of his duties. He either instituted the senate or converted it into a committee and agent of the assembly. He es-

tablished the first jury, which contributed much to the influence of the poorer class of citizens in the government.

By creating the popular assembly, senate, and juries, and transferring to them much of the authority previously held by the Areopagus, Solon greatly reduced the importance of that body, to which he left jurisdiction to try certain crimes, including that of sacrilege, and perhaps some civil suits, and also to prepare or correct the census and the lists of candidates admissible to certain political offices.

The exclusion of the Areopagus from direct participation in legislative and administrative business, as the associate and counselor of the assembly, was a serious political blunder. As a collection of the men who held their positions for life and had served in most of the high executive and judicial offices, it possessed a large combination of experience and capacity. Indeed, if the ex-polemarchs and ex-treasurers had been added to the ex-archons, the Areopagus might have become equal in its knowledge, political wisdom, and steadfast policy, to the Roman senate, which was established three-quarters of a century after the reform of Solon.

The Athenian senate, in its functions, was entirely unlike the Roman senate, or any modern senate. It was not a legislative body. Its consent or participation was not necessary to the validity of any law. It was not a separate "house." It was a mere committee, or satellite, of the popular assembly, in which all the senators had votes, and which all were expected to attend.

Besides establishing the general assembly, Solon organized tribal assemblies, which, among other duties, selected candidates for the archonship and senatorship;

and from these candidates the officials were drawn by lot.¹ After the drawing, the names were submitted to the Areopagus, which could cancel any selection and order another name to be drawn in its place. The lot was considered a divine decision, and the official chosen by it did not regard himself as exclusively indebted for his place to any political party.

The prominence of lot in the selection of officials is a noteworthy feature of Solon's constitution. It gave so much satisfaction that it was retained as long as Athens remained democratic, and it was copied by various other democracies of ancient Greece, and also by medieval Venice. It was not an unlimited trust to chance. It never placed men grossly ignorant or stupid or notoriously corrupt in high office. It was limited to relatively few nominees. Out of more than 10,000 Athenian citizens, forty were nominated for the archonship, and from these forty, nine were taken by lot.

SEC. 370. *Citizenship Dignified*.—Besides giving to every citizen not tainted with crime a right to an equal vote in the popular assembly which exercised the highest functions of sovereignty, Solon greatly increased the number of citizens by enfranchising many aliens who were merchants and manufacturers in Attica, profiting by its increasing industry. This liberality added to the harmony of the population and to the power of the state. It was in accord with a similar measure adopted four or five centuries earlier by Theseus.

While conferring on every freeman a right, he also made it his duty to participate in the government. In case of any insurrection he required the citizen openly to take one side or the other, and if necessary to fight for it. He who remained neutral, who waited until the

uncertainty and danger had passed before he declared himself, was not fit to be a citizen of Athens. He was disfranchised.

He abolished enslavement for debt, a law that had prevailed extensively in Greece for the benefit of the nobles who had been the owners of the land as well as the masters of the government. When these nobles leased or sold their lands, they reserved the right of enslaving the purchaser or tenant who failed to pay his debt, and not only him, but also his wife, his child, and the unmarried women of his family, such as sisters in his household. This kind of personal security was pecuniarily profitable to the noble but degrading to the commoner. Solon considered it irreconcilable with the spirit of democracy and abolished it. He liberated a large number of slaves who, for debt, had been reduced to bondage. He also abrogated the law which permitted a father to sell his child into slavery. He lightened the burden of debt resting on many of the poor by a measure not clearly described. He established systems of coins, weights, and measures to supersede the conflicting foreign standards previously accepted. After his time, and perhaps because of his teachings, Athens was distinguished by a pure coinage and by regard for vested interests and fidelity to explicit contracts.

Government and religion as conceived by the Greeks were inseparable. The state was under the protection of a local divinity, who was the guardian of every legitimate official and of every noble. Under the hereditary monarchy, the nobles had also their ancestral or household divinities, which were the celestial subordinates of the god of the state. The commoners and slaves had no gods, and no share in the state worship, and when a free-

man was enslaved or exiled, he was deprived of his gods as well as of his citizenship. The godless condition of the commoners, the same in the aristocracy as under the monarchy, led the nobles to resist, with the greatest bitterness, the early attempts of the commoners to obtain any share of political power. Solon remedied this evil or part of it by instituting religious rites for all those citizens who had none previously. By admitting them into the communion of the gods, he gave a higher dignity and a kind of sanctity to the newly enfranchised freemen.

He aspired to make Athens a maritime power, and for that purpose divided Attica into forty-eight naval districts, each of which had to build and man a trireme, and keep it and its crew in condition for immediate service. This was the beginning of the fleet of Athens, and though for nearly three quarters of a century it did nothing considered worthy of record in the books that have come down to us, like Solon's democratic reform, it proved to be the foundation of a great system.

He stimulated the manufactures of Attica. He forbade the exportation of any agricultural produce save olive oil, which was superabundant, and in such high repute throughout Greece that it yielded a large profit. Athens had already become noted for commerce and manufactures. She imported grain and salt fish, some quadrupeds for food, and wool and flax for clothing. By taxation and shipping laws he favored the importation of raw materials and the exportation of manufactures, and he did much to make Athens the leading commercial city and naval power of Greece.

He sought to take the stigma of dishonor from poverty and toil. He offered the citizenship of Athens to

those foreigners who should come to remain as permanent residents and to follow some branch of manufacturing industry. He encouraged native citizens to work by a law that, in his helpless old age, the father could not demand support from a son to whom he had not taught some profession.

"It is interesting to notice the anxiety, both of Solon and of Draco, to enforce among their fellow-citizens industrious and self-maintaining habits; and we shall find the same sentiment proclaimed by Pericles at the time when Athenian power was at its maximum. Nor ought we to pass over this early manifestation in Attica, of an opinion equitable and tolerant towards sedentary industry, which in most other parts of Greece was regarded as comparatively dishonorable. The general tone of Grecian sentiment recognized no occupations as perfectly worthy of a free citizen except arms, agriculture, and athletic and musical exercises."¹

SEC. 371. *First Jury*.—Solon established a jury, the first institution of the kind known to history. He gave to public opinion, as represented by the mass of freemen, a share in the administration of justice. His jury numbered from one hundred and fifty to five hundred men, thirty years old, and was drawn by lot from the freemen of a senatorial district, after the list had been subjected to censorial supervision for the exclusion of disreputable persons, who had not been deprived of citizenship. The jurisdiction of the jury as organized by Solon is not clearly stated by any author, and was perhaps limited to political crimes, the class of cases in which it was most important that public opinion should be consulted, and in which the archons, who, in the time of Cleisthenes and for a generation after him, were almost invariably of

noble blood, could not render decisions against partisan enemies without subjecting themselves, and the administration which they represented, to suspicion. A judge who exercises exclusive and final jurisdiction over suits involving the fortunes and lives of his fellow-citizens, rarely escapes without numerous accusations of inconsiderate action, partiality, social prejudice, partisan animosity, or corruption. Such complaints may become the sources of serious disturbances when they are made in regard to political offenses, and divide the people into two hostile masses of nearly equal force. The best remedy for this danger, the best method of relieving the officers of the government from such responsibility, is to throw the burden on the people themselves. That is what Solon did.

One jury of five hundred was drawn annually from each senatorial district, and shortly before the trial was to begin, a lot decided which jury should sit in any special case. The litigants and their agents had no opportunity to have secret meetings with persons known to be members of the jury that was to try the case. The hearing opened in the morning, and the verdict was usually rendered before the close of the day. Although the full jury was five hundred, yet it was not necessary that all should attend, and in many suits there were not more than two hundred jurymen. Whatever the number, a majority of one sufficed to render a valid verdict. This could not be set aside or reversed by any authority, and was the judgment of the court of last resort. The jury sat under the presidency of an archon, who had no authority to try without a jury, even at the request of the litigants; to determine the admissibility of evidence to punish litigants, witnesses, jurymen, or spec-

tators for contempt; to adjourn the hearing; or to give instructions in the law to the jury.

Left to the guidance of their impressions, the juries were greatly influenced by their passions, prejudices, partisan friendships, and animosities. Their large number made them excitable and disorderly. Their selection by lot secured a considerable proportion of ignorance, inexperience in public business, and folly. No person was allowed to plead save the litigant, but he might recite a speech written for him by some professional rhetorician; he could bring his weeping wife and children before the jurymen, and say anything that would gain their sympathy for him or awaken in their breasts hatred of his opponent.

As there was neither a complex system of technical procedure, nor a legal profession, nor an elaborate statement of law in any department, the general management of a trial was entirely different from that usual in modern courts. Written records, the sifting of evidence under strict rules, and discussion of the applicability of ancient statutes or codes to the special circumstances of the case under consideration, occupied a very small place before the Athenian *dikasts*, as the jurymen were termed. With them nearly everything depended upon plausible statement, sympathetic appeal and testimony that to a man trained in the law would seem unworthy of being heard. The courts became schools of rhetoric and eloquence; and soon no man was considered well educated unless he could talk well in public, and thus be prepared in case of emergency to plead his own case, whether civil or criminal, in the courts.

Speaking of the Athenian juries, Grote says: "But whatever may have been their defects as judicial instru-

ments, as a stimulus both to thought and speech, their efficacy was unparalleled in the circumstances of Athenian society. Doubtless they would not have produced the same effect if established at Thebes or Argos; the susceptibilities of the Athenian mind, as well as the previous practice and expansive tendencies of democratical citizenship, were also essential conditions,—and that genuine taste of sitting in judgment and hearing both sides fairly, which, however Aristophanes may caricature and deride it, was alike honorable and useful to the people. The first establishment of the *dikasteries* is nearly coincident with the great improvement of Attic tragedy in passing from *Æschylus* to Sophocles. The same development of the national genius, now preparing splendid manifestations both in tragic and comic poetry, was called with redoubled force into the path of oratory, by the new judicial system. A certain power of speech now became necessary, not merely for those who intended to take a prominent part in politics, but also for private citizens to vindicate their rights, or repel accusations in a court of justice. It was an accomplishment of the greatest practical utility, even apart from ambitious purposes; hardly less so than the use of arms or the practice of the gymnasium. Accordingly, the teachers of grammar and rhetoric, and the composers of written speeches to be delivered by others, now began to multiply and to acquire an unprecedented importance, as well at Athens as under the contemporary democracy of Syracuse, in which also some form of popular judicature was established."¹

Besides the influence of the jury in stimulating the art of oratory, and the education of the young men of wealthy families, it had another and a very important beneficent

effect, in making the people familiar with public affairs and public men. Many of the more important lawsuits were connected, in one way or another, with the conduct of the government, and could not be decided without hearing witnesses and speakers who had much to say about politics and the political history of Athens and of Greece. The courts became schools for adults. While preparing to decide the rights of others, the jurymen were taking instruction in their duties as citizens. The more acute among them—and these were numerous enough to give character to the whole community—became noted for their argumentative disposition, their skill in disputation, their generous reception to distinguished dialecticians, and their liberal patronage of the founders of the leading systems of Greek philosophy.

"As to the effects of jury trial, in diffusing respect to the laws and constitution, in giving to every citizen a personal interest in enforcing the former and maintaining the latter, in imparting a sentiment of dignity to small and poor men, through the discharge of a function exalted as well as useful, in calling forth the patriotic sympathies, and exercising the mental capacities of every individual, all these effects were produced in a still higher degree by the *dikasteries* at Athens; from their greater frequency, numbers, and spontaneity of mental action, without any professional judge, upon whom they could throw the responsibility of deciding for them."²

"The public and frequent *dikasteries* . . . opened to the Athenian mind precisely that career of improvement which was best suited to its natural aptitude; they were essential to the development of that demand out of which grew not only Grecian oratory, but also, as secondary products, the speculative moral and political

philosophy, and the didactic analysis of rhetoric and grammar, which long survived after Grecian creative genius had passed away."³

SEC. 372. *First Democracy*.—The three main original measures of Solon were, first, the establishment of the popular assembly, in which all freemen had an equal vote, as the supreme political power; second, the creation of the jury; and third, the abolition of slavery for debt. These measures had, so far as we know, never been previously tried by any people. His encouragement of immigration was also a novelty in government. The admission of aliens to citizenship had doubtless been tried in many cities, and was one of the reforms of Theseus in the days of the Athenian monarchy.

A democracy is a government in which the supreme authority is the majority of freemen, and in which every high political office is conferred directly or indirectly by popular vote. If this definition be correct, then the constitution of Solon was truly democratic, notwithstanding the fact that it recognized the legality of slavery, required a property qualification for office, and allowed the rich men, or nobles, to have a preponderant influence in the administration.

The political system established by Solon may be called a direct or immediate democracy. With some modifications it became the model of all other ancient democracies. It was direct because the people exercised all the legislative authority directly. They did not select any body of men to make laws for them. They had no legislative representation, no house of deputies or senators whose consent was necessary to the enactment of any law. Direct democracy is practicable only in small states, and it exerted a great influence in maintain-

ing the political divisions and the military weakness of Greece.

Having completed his scheme of political reform, Solon submitted it to the people in 594 b. c. They accepted it and elected their officers under it, with him as first archon, and published it by inscribing it on pillars; but it did not work smoothly. The officials and the people were not educated to it, and many of the nobles made as much trouble as possible. Solon was called on so frequently to explain and to interfere, that at last his patience was exhausted, and he left Athens; not, however, until he had called together his fellow-citizens and exacted from them a formal promise that they would not change any of the main features of his constitution until after a lapse of ten years. He traveled in Egypt, Cyprus, and Asia Minor; and, after having been absent for an unknown length of time, returned to Athens, where he remained till his death, which is supposed to have occurred about 558 b. c.

These laws remained in force for thirty-two years, and, after being partially suspended for half a century, while Pisistratus and his sons held despotic power, were again restored to full force, and under the leadership of Cleisthenes, Aristides, and Ephialtes, were amended to give greater political privilege to the poorer classes of citizens. Solon not only laid the foundation, but erected a large part of the superstructure, of this most popular form of government, and from him all other framers of democratic constitutions have learned most of their lessons and derived most of their encouragement.

SEC. 373. *Pisistratus*.—Although the constitution of Solon was strong enough to maintain its existence, it was so weak that it failed to prevent frequent and serious dis-

turbances. Its main defect was that it accepted the old tribes, which were aggregations of clans, and these latter were under the control of the nobles, who were the enemies of democratic institutions. The nobles, however, could not unite their forces, but divided into two parties, one the faction of the west and the other that of the south. Arrayed against them both, was the party of the poor, comprising the mountaineers of the northeast and the laborers of Athens. One day in 560 b. c., while the popular assembly was in session, Pisistratus, the leader of the party of the poor, seated in his chariot, drove into the market-place, called out that assassins had tried to kill him because he was a friend of the people, exhibited some wounds, which he said they had inflicted on him, and appealed to the multitude for protection. The assemblage voted that he should have a body guard of fifty men armed with clubs. After a few weeks swords were substituted for clubs; then the number of men was increased; then Pisistratus seized the citadel, and finally he assumed despotic power, though he observed the forms of the constitution. His adherents controlled the assembly; his servants occupied the offices; his orders were obeyed in all the acts of the government.

But his tenure of power was short. The two hostile parties of nobles united their forces, and, seeing that he was not strong enough to resist them, he went into exile. Soon the two parties of nobles quarreled about the manner in which the government should be administered, and neither was strong enough to preserve public order. Then the leader of the one noble faction, that of the south, made a league with Pisistratus, and the latter drove into Athens in his chariot, with a large and handsome woman, dressed as the goddess Athena, at his

side, followed by a troop of his adherents, and preceded by heralds, who called out, "Athenians, give a cordial reception to Pisistratus, whom Athena honors above all men, and whom she brings back to her acropolis." The nobles of the west were not prepared for this emergency, and perhaps many of them, in their ignorance and credulity, really believed that the woman in the chariot was the goddess of the city. They made no resistance, and Pisistratus regained his power. His alliance with the nobles of the south soon came to an end, and again he went into exile. After an absence of ten years, he returned with an armed force, routed the troops sent against him, regained possession of the city, and then held it till his death. He now kept a Thracian body guard, as if he could not put full reliance in Athenians, even those of the party who had been his adherents for many years. He had a long reign, thirty-three years, including those spent in exile. It was a prosperous period for Athens. Pisistratus was a mild and generous despot. He preserved the forms of the constitution, fostered trade, patronized art and literature, pursued a policy of peace, and spared the money of his subjects, as well as the blood of his political opponents. He employed a number of scholars to prepare a correct edition of Homer, and this commission did their work so well that the high value of their services was recognized throughout Greece. Their edition was never superseded. Pisistratus founded the quadrennial Panathenaic festival, which recurred in the third year of every olympiad, and became the greatest national festivity of Athens. After his death, in 527 b. c., his sons Hippias and Hipparchus succeeded and ruled jointly until the latter was assassinated by Harmodius and Aristogiton. Then Hippias began to rule with

cruel severity, and thus made himself hateful to the multitude, and encouraged his enemies to resort to active measures for his overthrow. The Alcmeonid family, who had been at the head of the nobles of the south when Pisistratus made his first appearance in politics, were the leaders of the opposition, and they included men of wealth, talent, and energy. The chiefs of this family had taken a contract for \$575,000 to rebuild the temple of Delphi after it had been destroyed by fire in 548 b. c., and they made the building vastly better than the terms of the agreement required. They built the front of the best white marble, instead of using the coarse sandstone designated in the specifications, and in other points they acted with equal generosity. As the temple of Delphi had a Panhellenic character, and was indeed the chief seat of the Panhellenic sacerdotal authority, and as the cost of the new building had been collected by subscriptions in all the Hellenic cities, the liberality of the Alcmeonids was not only known, but was gratefully acknowledged everywhere, and nowhere more emphatically than among the priests in Delphi.

When the tyranny of Hippias had become disgracefully severe, when the public sentiment at Athens was so hostile to him that his overthrow was a matter of certainty, though its date could not be foreseen, and when the Alcmeonid nobles, whose ancestors had been banished for sacrilege, had become the leaders of the movement to expel the tyrant, then the priests of Delphi imposed on Sparta, the leading military state of Greece, the duty of liberating Athens. Whenever a Spartan applied to the Delphic oracle for advice, the first reply was, "Athens must be liberated." Such commands often repeated impelled the Spartans to send an army against Hippias, and

after a defeat he went into exile in 510 B. C., and Athens was free.

SEC. 374. *Cleisthenes*.—Under the rule of Pisistratus and his sons, the administration was conducted in accordance with many of the requirements of Solon's constitution. The tribal assemblies elected as candidates for archons the persons suggested by the despot. These archons rarely summoned the assemblies save for the annual elections, and then submitted little business to the people for their consideration. Thus the proceedings at these gatherings came to be perfunctory, as the influence of the despot, supported by the desire of the citizens generally to preserve public order, was sufficient to secure an overwhelming majority for his candidates. If violence and cruelty had been necessary to defeat his enemies, he would probably have used them, but he, as well as his opponents, preferred peace. Thus the forms of a democratic constitution were observed, while its spirit was violated.

After the expulsion of Hippias, the Solonian constitution was again administered in accordance with its spirit. Two political parties contended for the control of the government; one led by Isagoras and the other by Cleisthenes—both nobles. Having been defeated, the latter proposed a series of constitutional amendments, which commended themselves to the judgment of his fellow-citizens, and were adopted. According to Herodotus, "he took the people into partnership with him." The reforms of Cleisthenes were progressive in a democratic direction, they increased the powers of the popular assembly, and decreased those of the nobles and rich men. They assumed that the Athenian freemen, as a class, could be intrusted with more power than Solon

thought a century before he could safely confer on them. And subsequent events proved that Cleisthenes was right, as Solon probably was in his time. The interval between the two reformers had added much to the political education of the Athenians.

The chief measure of Cleisthenes was the abolition of the clan as a political division. He found the state a collection of clans; he made it a collection of citizens. Before the adoption of his reformatory measures, the clan was a powerful political, as well as social and religious, organization. It claimed the highest allegiance of the Athenian; it authorized his adoption into a family; it protected his life; it enabled him to participate in the most sacred public worship; it led him into the battlefield; it avenged his death; and it gave him a burial that secured his rest in the life to come. The obligation of mutual defense, which rested on the fellow-clansmen, was the chief protection of human life. It gave to the clan a great hold on the affection of the people, and it was the source of traditional sentiment which remained potent long after the state had assumed much of the duty of guarding all its citizens.

Every clan had a common cemetery at the tomb of its ancestor; there every clansman must worship, and there he must be buried. Thus it may be said that each clan had its separate religion. The common worship of the clan was paid to the founder of the clan exclusively, and did not in any manner interfere with the family worship paid by the citizen to his deceased father and grandfather at his domestic altar.

The head of a Greek clan was always a man, the woman had no substantial place in the organization. The wife was adopted into it; the daughter belonged to

it temporarily; she was expected to leave it for transfer to the clan of her husband. The blood of the clan passed exclusively through the husband; the mother was to the child what the field is to the grain, simply the place where it grows. The son who slew his father broke the allegiance of his clan, and committed sacrilege as well as crime; he violated a religious as well as a political obligation. Not so the son who slew his mother, his act was criminal but not sacrilegious. As the blood of the mother did not pass to her children, so there was no legal obstacle to the marriage of the half-brother and half-sister born of the same mother.

As the clan was a political body, it was also originally a distinct military body. It formed a squad or a company, and its commanding officer was its hereditary chief, who, however, had to give way as discipline improved, to officers selected on the ground, not of seniority in the clan, but of military efficiency.

The idea, that the man's highest political allegiance was due to the head of his clan, had not disappeared in historic Greece, though in many states it had been much weakened by the feeling of intense devotion to the city. The system of retaliation had been abandoned, but clansmen—though in certain cases friends who were not clansmen could act—were required to become complaining witnesses, and if they remained silent, the officers of the law had no authority to take notice of crimes in so far as they injured individuals.

The constitution of Solon confirmed or recognized the older laws and customs which required the Athenians generally to vote and fight, as well as to worship and marry under the direction of the clans. But in the elections, the numerous naturalized citizens and their de-

scendants who did not belong to those organizations, had little influence. And even the poorer citizens, as a class, were under the control of the wealthy nobles who were the heads of the clans, and kept a close supervision of the conduct of their subordinates, exerted a constant pressure upon them, and thus dictated the policy of the state. Although the form of the government was democratic, the nobles had so large a share of political power that the people lacked confidence in themselves, and showed little of that eminent public spirit which soon afterwards became their glorious characteristic.

Cleisthenes destroyed the political influence of the clan. He abolished the four tribes or collection of clans into which the Athenians had previously been divided. For governmental purposes he arranged the people into new classes, based not on blood, but on territory. He established thirty townships or demes in Attica; and after arranging them in three classes, of city, interior and seacoast, he took one from each class to form a district, which became an important political organization. The district elected fifty senators, a general (who was also one of the ministry), a treasurer, an auditor, and a tax collector. It furnished a regiment to the army and elected its colonel. It had so much to do that, very soon after its establishment, the old tribe and clan as political influences were forgotten. Comprising a township in the city, another in the interior, and a third on the seacoast, with considerable intervening distances in many cases between these subdivisions, the new senatorial district was not controlled by any interest of occupation or neighborhood. Its representatives felt that their main duty was to labor for the advancement of the whole state, not of one of its parts. Among the results of these changes

was a great decline in the political influence of the nobles.

Almost as important as the political extinction of the clan was the constitutional amendment proposed and carried by Cleisthenes, that the popular assembly must hold a regular meeting at least once in nine days. Under the system established by Solon, the only regular meeting was that held for the annual election; the others were held under special call. Besides the forty regular convocations in a year, there might be as many special assemblies as the ministry should see fit to summon. The frequency and regularity of these gatherings led to the custom of bringing nearly every political question of any note before the people for their consideration and action; with the result that the multitude gradually became familiar with all branches of governmental affairs.

With the increasing importance of the assembly, the senate, its committee, became more prominent. The senators were increased in number from four to five hundred, and, instead of being taken from the four tribes, as they had been, Cleisthenes provided that they should be chosen by his new districts. Of these each selected fifty senators, who were called a prytane, and were divided into five sub-prytanes of ten senators. Each sub-prytane had charge of the acropolis for one week, during which period all its members dined there every day in what was considered a sacred meal, with such persons as were the guests of the city, including triumphant generals and victors at the Panhellenic or Athenian games. The keys of the acropolis were intrusted for each day to a senator selected by lot from his sub-prytane. The prytane met every day. No business could be brought before the senate except by its own order or that of one of its pryt-

tanes. In the selection of senators from the tribes, lot was used, how we do not know, but we may presume that the choice was limited to not more than two or three hundred men, each of whom had the repute of being worthy of senatorial office. The Athenians were a proud people, they wanted no criminals or clowns to represent their city at the communion of their guardian goddess.

The result of the frequent meetings of the senate was that that body obtained charge of all the public business to be submitted to the assembly, preparing everything in such a manner that the multitude should be enabled to act intelligently at short notice.

The ministry, consisting of ten generals, was elected annually, one by each of the ten tribes, and had the management of military, naval, and foreign affairs, under the direction of the assembly. The ten elected a general-in-chief, or president, who was practically the head of the government, though the law gave him no distinctive title, no pay, and no exclusive authority. The treasury, taxes, and financial income of all kinds were managed by a board of ten treasurers, elected annually, one by each tribe. This board elected one of its members to be chief treasurer. The public buildings, fortifications, and temples belonging to the state were under the control of a superintendent. The same person might be chief general, treasurer, and superintendent for year after year, and it was by being clothed with all these offices for a succession of terms that Pericles was enabled to control every department of the Athenian Government during the last years of his life, acting always in accordance with the letter and spirit of the national constitution, and sustained at every meeting of the popular assembly by the majority of the voters.

In after times, and perhaps under Cleisthenes, commands were distributed by the assembly to the generals soon after their election. One was assigned to the chief direction of the Athenian armies sent into foreign lands; another to the defense of Attica against invaders; a third to the charge of the harbor of Munychia; a fourth to Peiræus; and so on. Each district elected a colonel to command its detachment of infantry, and of two cavalry colonels, each was at the head of the horsemen of five districts.

Besides the ten treasurers, there were ten auditors, who had general supervision of the revenues, public offices, temple-grounds, mines, and other state property; ten tax collectors, who made reports to the auditors; ten custodians of sacred places; ten police commissioners; ten market masters; ten commissioners of weights and measures; ten state attorneys; thirty court commissioners to draw juries and assign cases to courts; and five road masters. All these held office for one year; and there were ten festival superintendents, whose term was four years, and whose chief duty was to manage the Panathenaic celebration, the great national festival of the Athenians.

The office of archon was preserved, but was greatly reduced in importance, by being deprived of all authority in military, naval, and foreign affairs, and of its exclusive judicial authority for the trial of small crimes. It was the duty of the archons to preside at jury trials, and they continued to hold jurisdiction in misdemeanors and in certain civil cases, to preside in the popular assembly, and to exercise a general supervision over various details of administration.

Ostracism was a semi-judicial procedure devised by

Cleisthenes for the purpose of getting rid in a constitutional manner of men like Pisistratus before they acquired strength enough to establish their power. When it was adopted, the greatest danger for Athens was supposed to be the possibility of a restoration of the despotic government. A majority of the intelligent citizens might be fully satisfied that some ambitious man in their midst was scheming to overthrow their free government, and yet, as he had committed no crime, they could do nothing legally to check the execution of his plans. They could obtain no proof of his criminal intention until after he had struck his blow, and had either succeeded or failed in an attempt to establish a despotism. Cleisthenes provided them with a method of protecting themselves. He enabled them to banish the man suspected of plotting against the state. He required no evidence, nor even an accusation. In the preliminary proceeding, he would not allow the mention of any crime or person. In every prytany, or period of five weeks, the senate was required to consider whether the safety of the state required a vote of ostracism, and if so, to fix a day. That was all that the officers had to do, until the votes were to be counted and the result declared. The people did the rest. The senate had no authority to arouse public passion by asserting the existence of any special plot, or of directly or indirectly accusing any person of being at the head of such a plot. It could not limit the ostracism to any person selected as a proper victim. Whenever, at such an election, six thousand ballots written on oyster shells or potsherds bore the name of any one person, he must go into exile for ten years, without loss of citizenship or property, and at the end of his term he could return with all his rights.

This was a device as wise as it was original, but it failed of its purpose for the reason that the amendments of Cleisthenes gave such a feeling of unity to the people, and such a strength to the government, that from being the greatest of dangers, despotism became one of the least. Ostracism was maintained in force for three quarters of a century, and in that time ten persons were banished under its provisions. Of these the first was Hipparchus, a member of the family of Pisistratus, suspected of plotting to aid the restoration of Hippias; the second was Aristides; the third, Themistocles; the fourth, Cimon; the fifth, Thucydides, son of Melesias (not the historian); the sixth and seventh were the two grandfathers of Alcibiades; the eighth, ninth, and tenth, men of no prominence or political influence, but unpopular for social reasons. The last victim of ostracism was a music teacher, and soon after the vote against him, the Athenians generally became so much ashamed of the manner in which this measure, designed to protect the state, had been abused to gratify petty spite, that they loudly expressed the opinion that ostracism had outlived its usefulness. They did not repeal it, but they allowed it to fall into disuse.

Only three men of much political power were ostracised, and these—Aristides, Themistocles, and Cimon—were statesmen, eminent for ability, patriotism, and public service. While in exile, Aristides and Cimon labored so efficiently for Athens that each was recalled by a vote of the popular assembly; and Themistocles would doubtless have acted in the same manner if he had had an opportunity.

The conception and effective introduction of these measures entitle Cleisthenes to one of the highest places

in the list of political reformers. He abolished the clan as a political body, and the tribe as an aggregation of clans; he ordered frequent and regular meetings of the assembly, thus enabling that body to exercise its authority effectively; he reorganized the senate, and provided for a daily meeting of one of its sections, thus imposing on it a large amount of committee work in preparation for the assembly; he introduced ostracism as a check to plotters for despotism; he established the board of ten generals, with commands in the army and navy, and with supervision over foreign affairs; and he reduced the authority of the archons by transferring much of it to the generals, and the assembly. His amendments were numerous, original, and highly serviceable to the cause of constitutional freedom. They infused a new life into the government, and gave a new stimulus to the people. They developed the institutions which Solon had founded; they made Athens the most democratic of the Greek democracies. Solon had said that he considered his constitution incomplete; he had adopted, not the political system which suited him best, but the one which he believed to be best adapted to the Athenian people as they were in his time. His work was continued by Cleisthenes, and will be continued in the same spirit so long as free government shall have a place on the earth.

SEC. 375. *Isagoras*.—Of the share of Cleisthenes in devising the constitutional amendments attributed to him; of the order in which, or precise dates when, they were adopted; of the circumstances under which they were proposed; and of the distinguished individuals who gave their support to the reformer, we have no information. Neither do we know whether they were all enacted before the first interference of Sparta.

By bitter opposition to Cleisthenes and all his amendments, Isagoras had made himself extremely unpopular; and seeing no hope of his own return to power under the new condition of political affairs, and perhaps believing that democracy was the road to national ruin, he applied for help to the Spartans. They gave their aid to Isagoras; they detested democracy; they detested Cleisthenes, because he was the head of the Alcmeonid clan which had induced the Delphic oracle to expel Hippias from Athens; they detested him because, though a noble, he had devoted his talents to a policy of innovation and democracy; and they detested Athens because she was rapidly rising in wealth, credit, and power towards the first place among the cities of Greece.

With such motives for action, Sparta sent an army under King Cleomenes, who entered Attica unexpectedly, and was allowed to take possession of the Athenian acropolis without resistance. The government seems to have had no idea that he came with a hostile intent. Having established himself in the position which enabled him to assume the tone of a master, he banished seven hundred leading democrats—Cleisthenes had previously gone into exile—declared the constitution abolished, established an aristocracy, and designated three hundred friends of Isagoras as the rulers of the state. The Athenians who knew that Isagoras and others of their fellow-citizens had come with the Spartans, and who had submitted quietly, supposing that no serious harm was meant, had scarcely heard the last words of the decree of Cleomenes, as proclaimed by the crier, before they rushed to arms, threatened all the adherents of Isagoras and of the Spartans with death, showed that all save an insignificant and powerless minority were determined to

maintain their democratic constitution, besieged the acropolis, and compelled Cleomenes, who had laid in no stock of provisions, to solicit leave to retire from Attica. With him departed Isagoras, who then disappeared forever from history.

Cleisthenes and the exiled democrats immediately returned and prepared for war with Sparta. One of the precautions of Cleisthenes was to send messengers to Darius soliciting protection and promising submission to the Persian emperor. This embassy was sent without authority or knowledge of the popular assembly, which, resenting the unauthorized assumption of power as well as the proposed subservience to the barbarian oppressor of the Ionic cities of Asia Minor, disavowed the prayer and promise of the embassy to the Persian monarch. Thus Persia was offended when war with Sparta was expected; and at the same time the Athenians accepted the prayer of Plataea for protection against Thebes. Athens, which had been only a third-rate military power, found herself defying the three most formidable states within her reach.

Within a few weeks Sparta, with her Peloponnesian allies, and also Thebes and Euboea, took the field. The last two intended to act in conjunction, but the Athenians defeated each of them separately. The Peloponnesian army fell into discord and broke up. The Spartans, being too few to accomplish anything by themselves, returned to their own country, where they called a council of their allies for the purpose of collecting a large army, with which Athens could be crushed. In this council, Cleomenes, seeing that aristocracy could not maintain itself in Athens, proposed that Hippias, the expelled despot, should be restored to power, as the person most

competent to curb the Athenian democracy, and as a person to whom the Spartans owed a restoration, after they had been tricked by a bribed oracle to expel him from his throne. This proposition to states, all of which had either aristocratic or democratic governments, that they should establish a despotism in a free Greek city, was received with general dissatisfaction.

The Corinthian ambassador Sosicles thus gave vent to his indignation: "Surely heaven and earth are about to change places,—the fish are coming to dwell on dry land, and mankind going to inhabit the sea,—when you Spartans propose to subvert the popular governments, and to set up in the cities that bloody and wicked thing called a despot. First try what it is, for yourselves, at Sparta, and then force it upon others if you can; you have not tasted its calamities as we have, and you take very good care to keep it away from yourselves. We adjure you by the common gods of Hellas, plant not despots in her cities; if you persist in a scheme so wicked, know that the Corinthians will not second you."¹

This speech was decisive. The shouts of approval with which it was received by the allies indicated clearly to Sparta that she could expect no aid, and might encounter serious opposition, from those who long had been, and still wished to be, her friends. In mortification and discredit she abandoned, for a time at least, all designs against Athens, while the latter adhered to her reforms, consolidated them, and rose rapidly in wealth and power.

SEC. 376. *Persian War.*—Great as has been the influence of war in all ages, on the condition of mankind, hitherto we have found no connected story showing

clearly how an international conflict has had an important effect on the advance of culture. Indeed, we may say that hitherto we have found no history. We have discovered evidences of industry, art, society, polity, and religion, lists of kings, boasts of their victories, praises of their piety, and lamentations for their wickedness, but no comprehensive statement of the leading events in the order of their occurrence, with the causes that led up to them. We know that the Quichuans conquered and disciplined many savage nations in South America; that the Aryans introduced a higher culture into Hindostan; and that war contributed to give China, Babylonia, Assyria, Egypt, and Persia their power and prominence in ancient times. If, however, we look for clear information about the manner in which war exerted any notable influence on the progress of mankind before the Vth century b. c., we shall seek in vain. The historical details have been lost. Nothing has been preserved to us save myths, fictions, and facts without significance.

But in Greece we have connected accounts of wars, precise statements of their causes and progress, with indications of the manner in which political wisdom and martial discipline gave success; how cowardice, stupidity, and slackness in political and military relations, led to national ruin; how the energetic nations obtained control of the most desirable countries; and how the dross of humanity was burned out in the fires of battle.

The first war of much culture-historical importance described in history was that undertaken by Persia to conquer Greece. In the VIIth century b. c. the Hellenic cities of Asia Minor became subject to Lydia, and after the overthrow of Crœsus, to Persia. They paid an annual tribute, and occasionally supplied men and ships to

the army and navy, but were allowed to enjoy a considerable degree of freedom in their city governments, under their own laws and customs. The emperor designated one of their fellow-citizens as a despotic ruler, and required him to preserve peace and order. If he failed, another Greek was appointed to the place.

These Hellenic subjects of Persia were the best soldiers in the empire. In courage, military discipline, activity, energy, and military genius, it was admitted that they were superior; relatively few as they were, they probably could have preserved, and, at any time, could have regained, their independence, if they had combined their forces under a harmonious federal government of their own nationality. But they could not combine. Each city stood by itself; and if it occasionally gave a little aid to some of its neighbors, did not succeed in establishing a systematic and general concert of action. The Persians controlled a great force, which the isolated Greek cities were unable to resist.

In 499 b. c. the Ionic cities in the Persian empire, under the lead of Miletus, revolted and appealed for aid to the leading military power of Greece. But Sparta was unwilling to aid the suppliants, and she told them to go to Athens. There a favorable hearing and assistance were granted, but the expedition sent was entirely inadequate to the occasion. The Athenian troops made a raid far inland in Asia Minor, and burned Sardis, its provincial capital, but were compelled to retreat, and then were cut to pieces. The result of their expedition was that the imperial power acted with more energy and anger than before; that the rebels were crushed; that they were treated with a severity unexampled in their previous history; and that the emperor Darius deter-

mined to punish the Athenians for their interference. Years elapsed before he could restore order in his own dominions, and, meanwhile, for fear that his wrath should be forgotten, he ordered a servant to remind him three times at every meal, by repeating, "My Lord, remember the Athenians."

The first expedition of Darius against Athens was dispersed on the coast of Thessaly by a storm; and the next one, in 490 b. c., comprising 110,000 infantry and cavalry, landed at Marathon, where, in the middle of the previous century, the people had been devoted adherents of Pisistratus, and where his son Hippias, who accompanied the Persians as guide and adviser, with the expectation that he would be re-instated as despot of his native state, hoped to find the same support that had been granted to his father. But he did not understand the effect of the constitutional amendments of Cleisthenes. The people about Marathon had changed their feelings towards despotism and the family of Pisistratus. They had become devoutly attached to their democratic government. Without aid from the residents, Marathon offered little attraction to the Persians, and they had presumably embarked their cavalry,¹ and were embarking their infantry, to sail along the coast to a point nearer to Athens, when Miltiades, commanding an Athenian army of 11,000 men, including one thousand from Plataea, having been posted for ten days on a neighboring mountain, suddenly charged the invaders and inflicted upon them a crushing defeat. Both sides were astounded. The Persians expected to meet desperate courage in their enemies, for they had met it among some of the Asiatic Greeks, but they had no experience and no conception of such high discipline and military ferocity as that of the men under

Miltiades. That they who were considered invincible in Asia, even when contending with greatly superior numbers,—that they, the Persians, with 110,000 infantry and cavalry, and with 120,000 sailors, should be defeated in open daylight, at a place which they had selected for an encounter, by only 11,000 Greeks,—that was indeed a wonder and a great discouragement. The Athenians were surprised by their victory, by the military inefficiency of the enemy, whom they had feared greatly, and by the smallness of their own loss,—less than two hundred men.

The Persians returned without delay to Asia, and, after hearing the news from Marathon, Darius could remember the Athenians without the help of a slave to repeat their name at every meal. He adhered to his purpose of conquering Greece, and made preparations on a grand scale for the difficult task, but before they were completed, he died, bequeathing them to his son Xerxes.

Ten years after Marathon, Xerxes marched into Greece with an army at least fivefold greater than that sent by Darius, accompanied by a fleet proportionately large. Thessaly, Thebes, and several small states near Bœotia, submitted to the invader; the Argives remained neutral; the nobles of the aristocratic states generally wished to see the destruction of Athens; and the Delphic oracle, perhaps because of hostility to the democratic spirit, predicted ruin to that city.

The Spartans, who were threatened with the same subjugation as the Athenians, called upon their allies to join them in meeting the enemy north of Bœotia. Under command of their king, Leonidas, they took their stand in the pass of Thermopylæ, with an army, including Arcadians, Corinthians, Thespians, Phocians, Locrians, Phlians,

and others, about 60,000 men. Among the "others" were four hundred Thebans, who were regarded rather as hostages than allies. There were no Athenians, because they had all become sailors or were soldiers in their fleet; and *Ægina*, *Megara*, *Sicyon*, *Epidaurus*, and *Eubœa*, not represented in the land force at Thermopylæ, contributed to the navy.

It was supposed that the army of Xerxes could not march into Greece by any road save that through the pass of Thermopylæ, which was not more than thirty yards wide, with a wall thrown across it, so that a few hundred men might there resist the advance of thousands. There Leonidas probably would have checked, worn out, and demoralized the enemy, if a Greek traitor had not led a force of the Persians over the mountains to the rear of Thermopylæ, so that the pass was no longer tenable. Then Leonidas dismissed nearly all his army, but remained with three hundred Spartans, seven hundred Thespians, two thousand Helots, and four hundred Thebans. There they fought, and, after inflicting great loss on the invaders, all, save the Thebans, who sued for mercy and obtained it, there died.

The other Spartans and their allies returned to their homes or to the Isthmus of Corinth, where preparations were made to check the Persian march. The Athenians, unable to offer any efficient resistance by land to the invasion, without aid from their allies, who refused the help, were compelled to send away their families and domestic animals to various places of refuge, to abandon their city, which had no walls suitable for defense, and to go aboard their ships. Xerxes entered the city, burned and desecrated its temples, captured the acropolis, and seized such treasures as had been left there. His great army was

with him, and his fleet, including twelve hundred triremes and more than twice as many transports, in the adjacent waters; and there very near them were the three hundred and eighty triremes of the Greeks (two hundred of them Athenian), the only Greek force in sight. This fleet was under the command of the Spartan, Eurybiades, who did not feel at home on the water nor want to fight at a distance from the land force of his countrymen. He had the bravery of a soldier without the capacity of a general. At one time he was controlled by the reasonings of Themistocles, the Athenian admiral, who wished to fight without delay, and at another by those of the Corinthian admiral, who wanted to move the fleet to the Isthmus. After finding that Eurybiades was about to give an order for the departure of the fleet, Themistocles went to the trireme of Eurybiades, and told him that to move away from Salamis was to leave Athens to final destruction. If the Athenians could not be protected in Attica against the Persians, they would go aboard their fleet, and emigrate to some island in the west, where Persia could not reach them. This led to a new council, a long debate, and a postponement of final action. Then Themistocles sent a message to Xerxes that the Greek fleet was preparing to escape from the bay of Salamis by its southern entrance; whereupon a strong detachment of Persian ships was sent to close that channel. The next morning, September 20, 480 b. c., when the Greeks of the fleet saw that they must fight, they accepted the situation and determined to become the assailants. The Athenians took the lead, as if they were confident of victory, and the others followed with equal courage though less hope. The Greeks proved that their superiority on the sea was as great as on the

land. The Persians lost one-fifth of their ships, and the remainder, though three times more numerous than those of the Greeks, sought safety in flight. Salamis became as glorious as Marathon, in Greek history.

Xerxes was disheartened and frightened by the defeat, which had occurred under his own eyes, for when he knew that it was to begin, he took his station on a promontory so near to the bay of Salamis that he could see the battle distinctly. Without delay, he ordered his army to retreat to Boeotia, where he left 300,000 men under Mardonius, while he hurried away to Asia. The news of his defeat preceded him. No adequate stores were provided for the large army that accompanied him; no great fleet was ready to wait upon him, as when he marched out in the spring. Hunger, disease, and cold destroyed great numbers of his troops; and those who reached Asia were demoralized.

SEC. 377. *Platea*.—Mardonius spent the winter in Thessaly, and in the spring prepared for a march to the southward. His army was much larger than that of the allied Greeks, and was especially superior in its cavalry, which usually decided battles in Asia, but had had no opportunity yet to make itself felt in Greece. Besides his Asiatic cavalry, he had large detachments of good horsemen among his Thessalian and Theban allies. He had an abundant supply of gold to foster the discord, which usually prevailed among the Greek cities. And then he counted much upon negotiation. He did not wish to drive the Greeks to desperation, nor to impoverish their country. He was willing to allow them a large degree of local freedom, under the dominion, perhaps rather the protection, of Persia. He tried to convince them that he would deal gently with them, and that he wished

to be their friend. He appealed to the Thessalians and Boeotians, with whom, while he remained among them, he and his troops maintained the most kindly relations, at least with the ruling classes. He also called attention to the fact that when the Persians occupied Attica in the previous year, they had spared most of the vines, fruit trees, and dwellings.

Such were the ideas and arguments with which, in the spring of 479, Mardonius sought the alliance of Attica, using as his messenger a Thessalian prince, who stood high in favor with the people of Athens. The prince said that if the offer should be refused, Mardonius would again occupy their city, since the Spartans had plainly shown that they did not intend to protect any state north of the isthmus. The Athenians could not defend themselves by land without the help of the Peloponnesians, and it would be better to enjoy life as a tributary city under the Persian empire than to be in constant worry and frequent dangerous warfare as a weak, independent city.

When this embassy became known to the Spartans and their Peloponnesian allies, it filled them with consternation. It seemed so reasonable that they expected its acceptance, and if accepted, and the Persians established in Attica, aided by the Athenian fleet, by Athenian generalship, and by the habitual discord of the petty Greek states, there would be no hope for the maintenance of their national independence. The Spartans sent an embassy beseeching Athens to remain true to the cause of Hellenism and freedom. The reply was prompt and emphatic. It said:—

“Not all the gold that the whole earth contains—not the fairest and most fertile of all lands—would bribe us

to take part with the Medes and help them to enslave our countrymen. Even could we anyhow have brought ourselves to such a thing, there are many very powerful motives which would now make it impossible. The first and chief of these is the burning and destruction of our temples and the images of our gods, which forces us to make no terms with their destroyer, but rather to pursue him with our resentment to the uttermost. Again, there is our common brotherhood with the Greeks, our common language, the altars and sacrifices of which we all partake, the common character which we bear. Did the Athenians betray these, of a truth, it would not be well. Know then, if ye have not known it before, that while one Athenian remains alive, we will never join alliance with Xerxes. We thank you, however, for your forethought on our behalf and for your wish to give our families sustenance, now that ruin has fallen on us. The kindness is complete on your part, but for ourselves we will endure as we may and not be burdensome to you. Such, then, is our resolve. Be it your care with all speed to lead out your troops, for if we surmise aright, the Barbarian will not wait long ere he invade our territory, but will set out so soon as he learns our answer to be that we will do none of these things that he requires of us. Now, then, is the time for us before he enters Attica to go forth ourselves to Bœotia and give him battle.”¹

This language, adopted by the Athenian popular assembly, upon the proposition of Aristides, will, as Curtius truly says, “remain ever memorable, as long as the memories of history survive on earth.”

The request that the Spartans should advance promptly with the Athenians into Bœotia and there attack the Persians was disregarded, and again Attica was

devastated. When Mardonius was convinced that he could gain nothing by sparing Athens, he destroyed what was left of the city, and when he heard that the Spartans were on the march, he returned to Bœotia, where he would be among friends, and also have a better field for his cavalry, upon which he placed his main reliance for victory. The Spartans and their allies, numbering 110,000 in all,² and including eight thousand Athenians, found Mardonius, with his 300,000 Persians, occupying an entrenched camp at Platæa, and there they offered battle. He accepted their challenge and attacked them. They met him as it might be expected that Spartans and Athenians would meet Persians; they gave additional luster to the national fame gained at Marathon and Salamis. When the Persians found that they were defeated, most of them took refuge in their entrenched camp, into which the Athenians broke, and, with Spartan aid, made it a slaughter-pen for the dismayed Asiatics.

About the same time, and according to report accredited in the next generation, on the very day of the victory of Platæa the sailors of the Greek fleet on the coast of Asia Minor landed at Mycale, near Miletus, attacked the fortified camp of the Persian fleet there drawn up on the beach, took it, slew most of the Persian sailors, and destroyed all their ships. In his last years Xerxes, like Darius, needed no set speech of slave at every meal to remind him of Athens. Salamis, Platæa, and Mycale would have been sufficient stimulants for the memory of Xerxes, but the Athenians gave him others. They liberated all the Greek cities in Asia Minor; they expelled all the Persian despots from Thrace; they compelled the Persians to promise that no army of theirs would come within several days' march of the Ægean, and that no

one of their warships should make its appearance in that sea, which was converted practically into "an Athenian lake."

SEC. 378. *Aristides*.—After the battle of Mycale the Greeks of Asia Minor and the Ægean islands proposed the establishment of a league that should protect them against the Persians. This suggestion was received with favor by the Athenians, who had become the leading naval power; and the result was the organization of a confederacy, which had a common navy, and a common treasury under the control of Athenian officials. A list was drawn up of all the cities in the league—they numbered more than two hundred—with the contribution that each should make for the common defense, some to furnish ships, some money, and others both ships and money. The total sum of the annual payments to be made in coin was \$460,000. Aristides, the commander of the Athenian fleet, took a leading part in the organization of the confederacy; and the amounts to be contributed by the several cities, as suggested by him, were accepted as equitable. It was agreed that the Athenians should have command of the allied fleet and control of the treasury of the league, the money to be kept in the temple of Delos.

When this combination was made, the Hellenic cities in Asia Minor and in the Ægean archipelago had fresh recollections of the Persian oppression and fears of its renewal; and they were grateful to Athens for her protection. The alliance was based on the idea that all its members were to be benefited nearly in proportion to their population and wealth; that all should contribute according to their means in money or in ships and men; and that, besides having a fleet ready for use, the league

should have a stock of precious metal available without delay, for any contingency. Then, as now, money was indispensable for the most efficient warfare. The assessments went into the hands of the Athenian officials, but were not intended to be a source of profit to Athens. She had to contribute a large number of ships to the common fleet and a large amount of money to the common fund, more than any other city. She was not exposed to so much danger as Miletus, Halicarnassus, Samos, and other Greek cities in and near Asia Minor, but she must protect them to keep danger from herself. She had colonies, merchants, and merchant ships of her own at many points on the coasts of the *Æ*gean and Black seas; and besides her prosperity required that she should be able to keep all hostile fleets from the Hellespont, through which she obtained much of her grain supply. The restoration of Persian dominion in the *Æ*gean would mean great injury to Athens. That city was the main supporter and also the chief beneficiary of the confederacy.

Having taken the lead in organizing the Athenian league, and contributed greatly to the power and wealth of his city, Aristides was rewarded with the political leadership for ten years. He persevered in the policy proposed and established by Themistocles, that the state should devote most of its revenue to the maintenance of the navy. As chief manager of the confederacy, he treated the allies with such consideration that he never lost the name of "the just" abroad any more than at home; and yet he always strove, with much zeal and tact, to advance the interests of Athens. When any associated city suggested a willingness to pay a coin subsidy to the confederacy, rather than to supply men

and ships, as originally agreed, he encouraged and facilitated the change. Athens took the money, and furnished the equivalent naval force from her shipyards and her population, with large increase to her power and small addition to her taxation.

After a large proportion of those cities which at first had furnished ships to the confederate navy, had changed their contributions to money, which served to pay Athenian sailors, and large sums were sometimes accumulated in the treasury, it became evident that the little island of Delos, without any considerable population or garrison, was an unsafe place for such a deposit. The main office and the funds of the confederacy were thereupon moved to Athens, which became the head of a maritime empire.

It was impossible to adhere in Athens to the traditional requirement of military and naval service without pay. That system was excellent for Sparta, and for those cities where the heavy armed men were nearly all nobles; and also in those cities which engaged only in brief campaigns. It had done well in Athens before the defeat of Xerxes. But when the city had become the head of an empire which it must protect, and when it must keep many thousands of men in active service through at least eight months of every year, these men must be paid. A permanent navy was created, and though it included many slaves and aliens among the rowers, its soldiers, about one-fourth of the whole number, were citizens, and these gave character to the service. They were a standing army, but they never subordinated their citizenship to their soldiership; they never became more attached to their commander than to their government; they never encouraged an ambitious

traitor to their country; they never undertook to overthrow an administration; they never started a rebellion; they never even broke out into a serious mutiny. No Caesar, no Cromwell, no Napoleon appeared in Athenian history. The pliant soldiery ready to serve such ambitious leaders was not bred in Athens.

We may presume, for we have no positive information, that at the organization of the Athenian confederacy, jurisdiction to try interstate lawsuits within the league was conferred on the courts of Athens. When two hundred cities, most of them in Asia Minor or on islands near its shore, had combined their forces for mutual defense against Persian aggression; and when it was evident that they could not defend themselves effectively unless they could preserve peace among themselves, then they would find it necessary to establish an international or confederate court. Unless they had such a tribunal, the frequent disputes between the cities and the citizens of different states would lead to interstate wars, in which one or the other would almost inevitably apply to Persia for aid, and thus threaten the existence of the league. A confederate court was necessary for the preservation of interstate peace; and such a court, with the power to enforce its decrees, was found in the Athenian jury. But trials requiring the attendance of five hundred jurymen to settle disputes between residents of distant cities, demanded more time and attention than the Athenians were willing to give gratuitously. They already had more litigation among their own residents than they could attend to with satisfaction to themselves. The jury system had certain advantages, but it consumed much of the time and patience of the people. They had been accustomed to rendering this

service to their fellow-citizens without pay; but a pecuniary compensation was necessary to secure the attendance of the jurymen in interstate cases.

Aristotle tells us that Athens had 20,000 men on her pay-roll, more than on her list of citizens, and though he does not fix the time clearly, he leads us to believe that this was within twelve years after the battle of Salamis. Among the men then in the public service were nearly two thousand in political office, including the senators; six thousand jurymen; four thousand sailors; four thousand men on garrison duty out of Attica; and six thousand soldiers in Attica.¹

The invasion of Europe by Xerxes had many indirect results, among which were the stimulation of the pride of the Greeks in their nationality; the substitution of democracy for aristocracy in many of their cities; the rise of Athens to the first place among their states; the decline of Sparta from its previous preponderant position; the high development of Athenian literature and ornamental art; and the preservation of the first constitutional governments until they could be approved by experience, described in books and made available for the instruction of mankind in distant lands and times.

In the course of campaign after campaign, in which numerous Greek cities co-operated and in which the existence of all was at stake, the allies had abundant opportunities to observe and admire the heroic spirit that inspired the Athenians, the promptness of their action in every great emergency, their unfaltering courage in the midst of appalling danger, their confidence when all others expected ruin, their harmony in using all their forces to the best advantage, and their tact in managing the forces of other states.

Athens had recently been liberated from a despotic dynasty which had ruled for half a century. She had then adopted a series of novel experiments in constitutional law, and these were generally regarded, in other cities, as highly injurious to public order. It might be suspected that the spirit of discord which had reigned for more than a century was still cherished in secret, ready to burst forth and fill the state with confusion at the first provocation. The quiet submission of the citizens to the innovations of Cleisthenes was perhaps merely temporary. The expulsion of Isagoras and the refusal of the people at Marathon to give aid or encouragement to Hippias, could be attributed to hatred of the alien allies of those returning exiles.

But all such suppositions of weakness in the constitution, and of destructive discord between large classes of citizens in Athens, were contradicted by the events of the war. Military efficiency so high, diplomatic skill so great, concord so complete in the midst of universal privation, as well as after the most brilliant triumphs, could not be understood without the aid of the suppositions that the Athenian constitution was a distinguished success; that it had established harmony where discord reigned previously; that it had broken down the lines of animosity that had before set the commoners against the nobles, and the mountaineers against the dwellers in the valleys; that it had consolidated all classes into the most compact community of Greece; that their democratic institutions had taken a firm hold on their affections and greatly stimulated the development of their capacities.

SEC. 379. *Pericles*.—For about six years after the death of Aristides, the most influential man in Athens

was Ephialtes, who is described to us, by Aristotle, as an incorruptible man, a true friend of constitutional freedom, and a democrat. He accused a majority of the councilors of the Areopagus of misconduct in office, and obtained judgments of dismissal against them. Then he proposed to transfer jurisdiction over certain classes of lawsuits from the Areopagus to the popular courts, and over others to the senate; and these propositions were accepted by the general assembly. Thus the influence of the Areopagus was much reduced, seventeen years after the victory at Salamis, to which that body had greatly contributed, by supplying money to a large number of poor men on condition that they would serve in the fleet. We are told that this liberality added so much to the strength of the navy, and to the power of Athens, that the influence of the council rose considerably, though no change to increase its authority was made in the constitution.¹

For some cause not explained in our books, perhaps because of his success in impeaching councilors or reducing the authority of the Areopagus, Ephialtes was assassinated. It is worthy of remark here that he is the only prominent Athenian who died in that way. Political assassination was not a prominent feature in the life of Attica.

The death of Ephialtes in 462 b. c. was followed by a period of ten years, in which no one statesman had a preponderant influence in the administration, though Pericles and Cimon were both prominent. It was at this time that the office of archon was made accessible to citizens of the third class; that is to those who had an income of two hundred and thirty bushels of grain.

Those of the fourth and poorest class were still disqualified, and so remained until after the beginning of the Peloponnesian war. The subsequent amendments to the constitution of Athens were enacted in disaster and decline; they added nothing to the power and glory of the city.

About 453 b. c. Pericles became the head of the government, with a great, if not a preponderant, influence over all branches of the administration; and he retained this position for twenty-four years, a period of unrivaled splendor in literature and art, and of wonderful prosperity in manufactures and commerce. In his combination of great qualities of statesmanship and oratory, of art administration and of honest citizenship, he was and still remains unequaled. He was the typical Athenian, and a substantial part of the brilliant pre-eminence of his native city. Year after year he was elected one of the generals who formed the ministry. They chose him as their president, and usually adopted his suggestions. No constitutional provision forbade the cumulation of executive offices, and he was elected one of the treasurers, and also one of the commissioners, of public works. His associate treasurers and commissioners accepted his leadership, as did his associate generals, and thus he controlled the public funds and the public improvements, as well as the army and the navy. By his superior eloquence he led the assembly, and thus was master of all departments of the government. But his mastership was exercised in accordance with the spirit as well as the letter of the constitution. He usurped no power; he assumed no dictatorial tone; he wounded no proper pride in his official associates; he trespassed on no substantial right of even the humblest citizen.

Although the leader of the more democratic of the two political parties, Pericles did not flatter the multitude, nor make himself familiar with them, nor practice the arts by which demagogues seek popularity. In his social and official relations, his manners were reserved. He rarely addressed the assembly, and never when questions of small importance were under consideration. He was compared with the sacred trireme which made its appearance only in the grand festivals. He had few intimate friends, and with these he was not very familiar. While he was in Athens, he spent his daytime in study or official labor, and his evenings in his own house, where he entertained many intellectual people. His mode of life was quiet and unostentatious. He did not encourage flattery, or pursuit of those who maligned him. Many enemies attempted to rouse popular animosity against him; but he made no effort to punish them for misrepresentations. He was above the suspicion of corruption, or of being influenced by the desire to enrich his followers at the expense of the state.

In all countries where demagogues have flourished, they have had the most favor among the poorest class of citizens, and, therefore, it has been their policy in countries which restricted suffrage, to diminish the restrictions and thus enlarge the number of voters. Only one change in the qualification of voters was made while Pericles was in power; and this fixed the number of citizens at 14,000, excluding nearly one-third of those who had previously claimed, and perhaps exercised, the privilege of voting. The circumstances of this census are not recorded; but we know that its tendency was aristocratic rather than democratic.

In his list of the men who made important changes in

the constitution of Athens, Aristotle does not admit Pericles, and does include Aristides, to both of whom, in passages not reconcilable with each other, he attributes the introduction of pay for jurymen. It may be that at first pay was given only for service in interstate trials, and afterwards in Athenian cases. Except the introduction or extension of jury pay, Aristotle ascribes to Pericles no change in the constitution save one that diminished, in a manner not explained, the authority of the Areopagus.

Another measure, to which demagogues systematically give their support, is that of extending the qualifications for office. The measure admitting the third class of citizens to the archonship was adopted while Pericles was prominent, but not yet predominant; and he is not mentioned as having taken any part in the introduction or advocacy of this measure. Nor do we read that he proposed to admit the men of the fourth or poorest class to the archonship. In his private and public conduct we vainly seek for anything that looks like demagogism.

Pericles spoke in the assembly with such majesty and impressiveness that he was compared with the Olympian Zeus in a storm, shaking earth and heaven with his thunder and lightning, and overwhelming all auditors and spectators with the grandeur of his manifestation. And the practical result agreed with the weight of his speech. With its help he obtained and maintained a control in a democratic state, unequaled, in political history, for its duration and completeness.

The controlling motive of Pericles, his constant care, was the good of the state. And he obtained it. Under his administration the most splendid temples of Athens

were built, the most beautiful statues were carved, the greatest of the Greek tragedies were written, the first stone theater was built, linear perspective was originated and perfected, the first immortal history was written, and by him the greatest of all orations was delivered. Under his superintendence the Parthenon was built and the statue of Athena was placed on the acropolis. For no other ruler can such a list of glorious achievements be collected. The world has never had another statesman who succeeded so marvelously in drawing out the artistic and literary capacities of his fellow-citizens.

The public life of Pericles "began about the time when Themistocles was ostracized, and when Aristides was passing off the stage, and he soon displayed a character which combined the pecuniary probity of the one with the resource and large views of the other; superadding to both a discretion and mastery of temper never disturbed,—an excellent musical and lettered education—. . . . an eloquence such as no one before had either heard or conceived,—and the best philosophy which the age afforded. His military duties as a youthful citizen were faithfully and strenuously performed, but he was timid in his first political approaches to the people,—a fact perfectly in unison with the caution of his temperament, but which some of his biographers [Plutarch] explained by saying that he was afraid of being ostracized, and that his countenance resembled that of the despot Pisistratus. We may be pretty sure, however, that this personal resemblance, like the wonderful dream ascribed to his mother when pregnant of him, was an afterthought of enemies, when his ascendancy was already established,—and that young beginners were in little danger of ostracism

"The ascendancy of Pericles was founded on his admirable combination of civil qualities,—probity, firmness, diligence, judgment, eloquence, and power of guiding partisans. As a military commander, though no way deficient in personal courage, he rarely courted distinction, and was principally famous for his care of the lives of the citizens, discountenancing all rash or distant enterprises; his private habits were sober and recluse,—his chief conversation was with Anaxagoras, Protagoras, Zeno, the musician Damon, and other philosophers, while the tenderest domestic attachment bound him to the engaging and cultivated Aspasia."¹

After the battle of Salamis, ten years may have elapsed before the houses of Athens had been rebuilt, and the orchards and vineyards of her adjacent territory restored to their former productiveness, but from 470 till 430 b. c. she was the most splendid of ancient cities. Her position in culture was relatively higher than that of any other city, ancient or modern. She had originated democratic government; she developed it to the highest degree known to antiquity; she made it the most brilliant success in all history, though for only a brief period. She suddenly became the most powerful state of Greece. She dictated terms to Persia. She called out unparalleled intellectual activity among her citizens. She carried statesmanship, generalship, oratory, and history—the arts that accompany a liberal and enlightened polity—to heights not reached before, and in some respects not surpassed since. She became the mother not only of history and oratory, but also of dialectics and philosophy, of tragedy and comedy. She became the home of sculpture, architecture, painting, dramatic art, refinement, and literature. She was the teacher of Greece,

the school of mankind, the arbiter of taste for all nations. She was the most brilliant example in all time of the patriotic devotion inspired and the literary energy fostered by free government. She produced the most glorious combination of contemporaneous great men ever known in one state, including Pericles, Æschylus, Sophocles, Phidias, Ictinus, Euripides, Socrates, and Thucydides. Her public works of architecture and sculpture were the most splendid ever seen in any city.

SEC. 380. *Political Education*.—It is impossible now to ascertain the dates when some of the amendments of the Athenian constitution were adopted. Of these the most important is that admitting all classes of citizens to the privilege of holding office. This has been attributed to Aristides, but Aristotle implies that it was not introduced until after the death of Pericles. Another provided that payment should be given to every man who attended a meeting of the assembly; and another that on the occasion of every theatrical performance given by the state each citizen should be entitled to a sum sufficient to pay for a seat, about six cents; but the recipient could spend the money as he pleased.

Still another of these amendments of unknown date was one providing that no enactment of the assembly should be considered as of general force unless it had been adopted after being made the subject of a report by the law committee or Nomothetes. Otherwise, no matter how broad its phraseology, it should be considered as a decree relating only to the special case that had led to its proposal. This amendment was a confession by the assembly that it could not trust its hasty impulses, and that it had been led into conflicting enactments. Against

the repetition of such mistakes, the best security was a law committee, which must carefully examine all the relations of any proposed measure to the older laws. Not only this, but the author of every bill was responsible for all the damages that might result from its adoption, if it should be inconsistent with other laws unrepealed, or if it should prove pernicious in practice. The unanimous approval of his bill by the law committee, and its adoption by the assembly, did not destroy or diminish his responsibility. If he wanted to play the part of a legislator, he must assume serious risks. He must thoroughly understand what he was about or abstain from undertaking to become a leader in the state.

Aristotle mentions eight men as the authors of great changes in the constitution of Athens, before the Peloponnesian war. These were, first, Ion, the traditional founder of the Athenian monarchy; second, Theseus, who, according to legend, consolidated the Attic monarchy; third, Draco, who reorganized the aristocracy on the basis of property; fourth, Solon, founder of democracy; fifth, Pisistratus, founder of a despotic dynasty; sixth, Cleisthenes, who made the democracy of Solon more democratic; seventh, Aristides; and eighth, Ephialtes, who amended the constitution so as to make it more democratic. The changes from monarchy to aristocracy, and from the dynasty of Pisistratus to democracy, are not attributed to the influence of single individuals.¹

The popular assembly met at sunrise, in the market-place, where the multitude stood under the open sky, while the ministry and senators were seated under a portico. Ordinarily the number of attendants did not exceed four thousand, and frequently was less, but when a ques-

tion arose of highly exciting interest, such as war, peace, sending out a large fleet or army, making an alliance, founding a colony, ordering the construction of a great fortification, or adopting an important constitutional amendment, there might be 12,000 or more, including many who came from the seaports and rural villages.

The discussion of such subjects before the mass of the freemen, and the habitual submission to them of the main facts and arguments, bearing upon both sides of every important point of governmental policy, made the Athenian market-place a great school of instruction, and gave to the citizens "such a political education as no other system can give."²

The wonderful triumphs of the Athenians over the Persians, at Marathon, Salamis, and Mycale; their energy in restoring their country after it had been devastated by Mardonius; their rapid development of their city from poverty to wealth, and from relative insignificance to preponderant power—all these were attributed by Herodotus to the harmonizing and stimulating influences of the democratic constitution. His immortal paragraph on this subject says:—

"Thus did the Athenians grow in strength, and we may find proof, not merely in this instance, but everywhere else, how valuable a thing freedom is; since even the Athenians, while under a despot, were not superior in war to any of their surrounding neighbors, but so soon as they got rid of their despots, became by far the first of all. These things show that while kept down by one man, they were slack and timid, like men working for a master; but when they were liberated, every single man became eager in exertions for his own benefit."³

The astonishing personal and many-sided energy which marked the character of the Athenians must be attributed in a great degree to the influence of their political system. Brougham remarks that "the universal competition of talents, the emulation in virtue, the personal interest in the public welfare, the zeal for promoting it, often at the expense of individual sacrifices, and very generally at the risk of individual suffering, not only led to the possession of extraordinary accomplishments, and the performance of brilliant exploits, but placed the whole powers of the community at the disposal of the government, and when sound counsels were followed produced results out of all proportion to the natural resources of the country." "It is not only true that Athens has produced and educated a relatively larger number of men of the highest calibre and most complete culture than any other community of like dimensions which has ever existed; but it is also true that there has been no other community of which the members have, as a general rule, been so highly cultivated or have attained individually such completeness of life."⁴ "By constantly hearing questions of foreign policy and domestic administration freely argued by the greatest orators that the world ever saw, the Athenian citizens received a political education which nothing else in the history of mankind has ever been found to equal. The ordinary Athenian citizen then must really be compared, not with the English ten-pound householder, but with the English Member of Parliament in the rank and file of his party. In some respects, indeed, the political education of the Athenian was higher than any which a private member in our Parliament can derive from his parliamentary position."⁵

We cannot get a distinct idea of the importance of the

assembly in Athens without recalling to our minds the fact that public speech was far more prominent in ancient Greek than it is in modern Euraryan life. The Athenian had no newspaper, no printed books, no weekly sermon, and for the multitude no evening gatherings in lighted halls. The orator told the news, discussed it, and gave lessons of morality, patriotism, and religion. He was listened to with an interest, and he exerted an influence which no modern orator can approach.

"It was in the assembly that the Athenians were trained," says Grote, "to the duty both of speakers and hearers, and each man, while he felt that he exercised his share of influence on the decision, identified his own safety and happiness with the vote of the majority, and became familiarized with the notion of a sovereign authority which he neither could nor ought to resist. This was an idea new to the Athenian bosom; and with it came the feelings sanctifying free speech and equal law—words which no Athenian citizen ever afterwards heard unmoved; together with that sentiment of the entire commonwealth as one and indivisible which always overruled, though it did not supplant, the local and cantonal specialties. It is not too much to say that these patriotic and ennobling impulses were a new product in the Athenian mind."⁶

The Athenian constitution created in the multitude and through them forced upon the leading ambitious men a higher form than any before known, "of that rare and difficult sentiment which we may term a constitutional morality; a paramount reverence for the forms of the constitution, enforcing obedience to the authorities acting under and within these forms, yet combined with the habit of open speech, of action subject only to defi-

nite legal control, and unrestrained censure of those very authorities as to all their public acts,—combined too with a perfect confidence in the bosom of every citizen, amidst the bitterness of party contest, that the forms of the constitution will be not less sacred in the eyes of his opponents than in his own. This coëxistence of freedom and self-imposed restraint,—of obedience to authority with unmeasured censure of the persons exercising it,—may be found in the aristocracy of England (since about 1688) as well as in the democracy of the American United States, and because we are familiar with it, we are apt to suppose it a natural sentiment; though there seem to be few sentiments more difficult to establish and diffuse among a community, judging by the experience of history. We may see how imperfectly it exists at this day in the Swiss cantons; and the many violences of the French revolution illustrate, among various other lessons, the fatal effects arising from its absence, even among a people high in the scale of intelligence. Yet the diffusion of such constitutional morality, not merely among the majority of any community, but throughout the whole, is the indispensable condition of a government at once free and peaceable; since even any powerful and obstinate minority may render the working of free institutions impracticable, without being strong enough to conquer ascendancy for themselves. Nothing less than unanimity, or so overwhelming a majority as to be tantamount to unanimity, on the cardinal point of respecting constitutional forms, even by those who do not wholly approve of them, can render the excitement of political passion bloodless, and yet expose all the authorities in the state to the full license of pacific criticism.”⁷

The rarity of violent revolution, of destructive mobs, and of partisan assassinations in long periods filled with a rapid succession of intense political excitements, are proofs that the mass of the free men had good training in parliamentary discipline, and that their public men, as a class, had learned to make allowances for those accusations of base and corrupt motives which accompany every quarrel involving many people—accusations which have their origin in ignorance, inexperience and folly more frequently than in malignity.

SEC. 381. *Direct Democracy*.—The Athenians originated the system of direct democracy, and, without aid from any other people, carried it to the highest development of which it was capable. On the plan of the immediate and frequent participation of the adult male citizens in the exercise of the highest functions of government, and in a state of 50,000 inhabitants, of whom most were slaves, there could not be a better political system than that of Athens. There might be a more efficient government, but not of that pattern.

The Athenian constitution reached its highest development before 450 B. C. Some amendments were made to it subsequently, but they were not notable improvements. After the adoption of the reforms of Cleisthenes, the nobles and commoners lived together in substantial harmony. The aristocratic party had many commoners among its voters; the democratic party always had a large proportion of the nobles among its adherents. Both parties had leaders of eminent capacity and high character, men who could treat rivals with generosity, and give their aid to wise measures proposed by their enemies. Aristides, the most influential of the aristocrats, was the author and successful advocate of several

democratic measures; and Pericles, the most influential of the democrats, favored the aristocratic policy on several important occasions. After Aristides had been banished by ostracism, Themistocles demanded his recall; and Pericles did as much for Cimon. Partisan opposition was often bitter, but sometimes generous.

Direct democracy was established in many Greek cities, which copied from the original model, some of them adopting modifications which were either unimportant or injudicious. Not a few of these imitations owed their existence to the direct or indirect aid of Athens, and when that aid ceased, or when Spartan compulsion was applied, the governments reverted to the aristocratic type. No other ancient city succeeded so well with a direct democracy as Athens, nor was any other so well adapted to it. The possession of a large middle class of educated men in a capital city which had the wealth of a large commerce and of extensive manufactures, without a population of sailors and ignorant laborers, was a highly fortunate circumstance for the Athenians, and for their system of government. Except during a half century after the battle of Salamis, either Persia, Sparta, or Macedon was nearly always dominant in Greece previous to the Roman conquest; and as these powers did not favor the existence of democracy in any city under their influence, there were few democratic governments, except during the period when Athens was the leading Hellenic state.

As in the governments of Venice, and of England, so in Greece, aristocracy often called out the zealous devotion of its subject commoners; but under the leading democracies, public spirit had a brilliancy and an energy never witnessed under less liberal forms of government.

To the Greek mind “the theory of democracy was pre-eminently seductive; creating in the mass of the citizens an intense positive attachment, and disposing them to voluntary action and suffering on its behalf, such as no coercion on the part of other governments could extort. Herodotus, in his comparison of the three sorts of government, puts in the front rank of the advantages of democracy, ‘its most splendid name and promise,’—its power of enlisting the hearts of the citizens in support of their constitution, and of providing for all a common bond of union and fraternity. This is what even democracy did not always do; but it was what no other government in Greece could do; a reason alone sufficient to stamp it as the best government, and presenting the greatest chance of beneficent results, for a Grecian community. Among the Athenian citizens, certainly, it produced a strength and unanimity of positive political sentiment, such as has rarely been seen in the history of mankind, which excites our surprise and admiration the more when we compare it with the apathy which had preceded,—and which is even implied as the natural state of the public mind in Solon’s famous proclamation against neutrality in a sedition.”¹

The relation of the average citizen to the state in a large modern republic is not like that of the Athenian to his city. He is one among millions. His share in the government is small, and he exercises it indirectly. He does not help to elect the highest officials every year; and he does not expect them to account to him personally at the end of their terms. No important question of foreign or domestic policy is submitted to him immediately. He does not vote on peace and war. He does not live in the city where the admin-

istration has its seat; he does not know its highest officials by sight. He does not expect to serve for year after year in war. He knows that if his country were conquered, he would neither be slaughtered nor enslaved, nor deprived of his property, nor even excluded from a voice in the government. He feels no special interest in a state religion, nor has he any national divinity who will be carried away by conquerors. No part of his worship is dependent, in any manner, on the maintenance of the independence of his native land. In many respects the bond between the citizen and the state is much weaker in the modern than it was in the ancient republic.

He who reads a detailed history of Athens, such as we find in Grote, is profoundly impressed with the frequent manifestations of remarkable wisdom, prudence, fortitude, and generosity in its popular assembly, which often rose to the highest level of statesmanship. But it also made serious mistakes, most of which must be attributed to the weakness of the senate, composed of men who had had little experience in public affairs, holding office for only one year, or perhaps it might be said for only one month, the subdivisions of the senate or *prytanes* having almost complete control of the senatorial business during their respective terms.

One of the most serious evils of direct democracy, as illustrated in the history of Athens, was the custom of deciding important questions without delay. The Assembly wanted to vote while their minds were full of the information submitted by the senators and of the arguments made by the orators. Any postponement was objectionable, because citizens absent at the first meeting and present at the second could not

demand a repetition of what was said before, nor without such repetition could they vote intelligently. The printed bills, reports, and speeches, which enable the modern legislator to keep facts, arguments, and amendments ready for examination at any moment, were not within reach of the Athenian, who, therefore, wished to dispatch every question on the day of its presentation. The custom of immediate decision necessarily led to many mistakes. It gave an undue influence to the ignorant men who think little, talk much, and follow their first impulses; and it aided the orators who pleased this class by appealing to their passions more than to their reason.

In modern civilized states one of the strongest guarantees of prudent government is the sense of responsibility in the representative legislator. He must consider, first, what is right, and second, what his constituents will think of his action. The press lays the facts before the people so that all can think for themselves, and it also lays before the people the votes and speeches of the different representatives, each of whom is then, so long as he lives, confronted with that precise and indestructible record. This imposes a responsibility unknown in the Athenian Assembly. There the citizen owed no account to anybody for his vote, and in his defense, he could plead that he acted in accordance with the advice of the most popular orators, and with the concurrence of the majority of his fellow-citizens.

SEC. 382. *Athenian Law Courts.*—The administration of justice in Athens did not lead to the adoption of an elaborate system of law. A large jury, drawn by lot from the list of citizens, clothed with exclusive and final jurisdiction over every important suit, whether civil or

criminal, with authority to decide finally every question of law and fact arising in the course of the trial, and not permitted to listen to professional advocates, did not encourage the labor of defining rights and remedies, nor did it provide men competent to make the definitions. Jurisprudence is a science, and it may be called an abstruse science. It is one that has reached a high original development in only two countries—Rome and England, in both of which it was aided by a large force of learned judges and lawyers, a steadfast national policy, an extensive dominion, and a rule that the law was to be interpreted by men who had made it their special study. Such conditions were wanting, not in Athens only, but in all parts of Greece. No Hellenic state has left anything of value in jurisprudence. Sparta had the needful stability of government, but neither lawyers, nor learned judges, nor written law. In the IIIrd and IIInd centuries b. c. Rhodes had an active commerce, and had better commercial laws than those of any other Greek city, but these laws have not been preserved to us; and as her territory was very small, and her prosperity brief, her legal system could not have been precious.

The main defect in the interstate jurisdiction of the Athenian juries, while the Athenian empire existed—a defect that perhaps prevented a long maintenance of the empire, and the development of a strong imperial constitution—was not understood by Aristotle, who was alive nearly a century after Athens had been ruined by the war that was partly provoked by her oppressive law courts. But that defect is plain to the modern lawyer, who sees that an absolute international jurisdiction over civil and criminal cases of great importance should never be intrusted to mob-like juries of ignorant and poor men

drawn from a single city, and interested in the encouragement of litigation. Such a judicial system would soon bring any modern federation or empire to destruction. But the Greeks had no judges trained by practice at the bar for judicial office; no powerful legal profession which, by its public opinion, influenced the judges; and no elaborate system of law which must be the production of learned judges, aided by learned lawyers. The high courts of modern Euraryan nations have many excellent features that were unknown to the ancient Greeks.

After it was understood that the average jury had a predominant feeling in favor of the plaintiff, base men, who were classed together as sycophants, made a practice of bringing suits against wealthy men—residents of the subject cities were preferred victims—for the purpose of plundering them in the Athenian courts; and in many cases the defendants, fearful of the expense and uncertain result of the trial, bought off the complainants. This method of judicial plunder was one of the causes of the Peloponnesian war, and of the ruin of Athens.

The evil was understood in the time of Pericles, but if any remedy was then proposed no mention of it has come down to our time. The interstate jurisdiction was necessary to the preservation of the empire, and this again was indispensable to the safety of the subordinate cities. The trial of these suits might have been given to a court without a jury, but no such tribunal commanded the public confidence. No judicial institution of high repute for learning and impartiality then existed in any part of Greece. There was no model anywhere of such a court as the empire needed, nor was there any ready made code of laws suitable to guide an international tribunal.

The defects of this Athenian jury system were illustrated by a remarkable series of unjust judgments,—the most remarkable series in the history of all time. When the litigant was an active politician, the luck of the lot might draw a considerable majority of jurymen from his political friends or enemies, and then partisan bias would control or greatly influence the decision. But political feeling seems to have been the source of less injustice than prejudices that had their origin in other sources. Some of the most notably unjust verdicts were rendered in accusations for impiety. Such were the charges against Socrates, who was executed; against Phidias, who died in prison; against Anaxagoras, who was banished; against Protagoras and Aristotle, who escaped by flight before trial; and against Aspasia, who had a narrow escape, though she was defended by the eloquence and influence of Pericles, then at the height of his power.

These outrages upon justice by juries were paralleled by others committed by the assembly. The most flagrant wrong in Athenian history was the execution of six of the generals who won the important naval battle of Arginusæ, in 405 b. c. This victory in the year preceding the close of the Peloponnesian war, when the forces of Athens were almost exhausted, raised the hopes of the Athenians so highly that their assembly rejected the Spartan overtures for peace, and, according to one account, would consent to no cessation of hostilities unless on condition that the Athenian empire should be re-established as at the beginning of the war. While thus acknowledging the immense importance of the victory, the assembly condemned to death six of the ten commanding generals, because they had been unable to save a

number of their fellow-citizens on vessels disabled in the fight. Immediately after the Spartans and their allies fled, the victorious generals held a hasty consultation to consider whether they should pursue the enemy or save their countrymen, and the decision was that they should divide their forces and do both. But a high wind came on, and they could do, or at least did, neither; and because they had not saved the men on the wrecks, they were condemned and executed. The assembly afterwards admitted the injustice of the execution, and ordered the prosecutors to be prosecuted, but public disorder prevented the case from coming to trial. In the next year the Athenian fleet, having been intrusted to incompetents, was completely destroyed and its men cut off, and the city was compelled to surrender. Among the generals executed for his share in the victory of Arginusæ was Pericles, the son of the great Pericles and Aspasia, a man of much promise, who had recently entered upon a public career.

For offenses that deserved some moderate punishment, Miltiades was condemned to pay two ruinous fines, which amounted in the aggregate to \$80,000—an immense sum in his time, and more than he could pay. Notwithstanding his long and devoted labors for his country,—labors which his fellow-citizens acknowledged in many ways,—Demosthenes was fined \$50,000 for some petty offense. Callias, who had made a most advantageous treaty, was fined an equal amount for something that did not deserve to be called an offense. Thrasybulus, son of the man who restored Athenian freedom after the Peloponnesian war, was fined \$10,000. Callistratus was dismissed from the office of general. The people of Athens have never been praised for protecting their dis-

tinguished fellow-citizens against malicious prosecutions, or for shielding them against unjust judgments when so prosecuted.

SEC. 383. *Drill and Sway*.—In Athens, as well as in Sparta, the citizen was necessarily a soldier. Nobody was exempt from service. Æschylus, Socrates, Demosthenes, Sophocles, and Thucydides, all had military training, and experience in several campaigns. The last two were generals. Pericles showed desperate courage at Tanagra. But there was an important difference between the military demands of Sparta and Athens on their citizens; the former required constant devotion to martial exercises; the latter was content with an occasional military drill. The Spartan citizen or noble regarded war as his chief occupation; the Athenian accepted it as an unwelcome interruption of his preferred study or industry. All the Spartans were nobles and hoplites; most of the Athenian freemen, being unable to provide themselves with full suits of armor, were either sailors or light armed infantry. The young men of Athens spent much time in arms. The state required them to give several years to military drill; and their ambition stimulated them to do more in that direction than the law demanded. The coward, the braggart, the loud talker, inefficient for service in the face of danger, no matter how rich, was despised. The brave, the prudent, the faithful, the fertile of resource in difficult and unforeseen emergencies, no matter how poor, were respected. In the gymnasium, the market place, the political club, and the elections, as well as in the military campaign, the good soldier was honored. The road to political promotion led through the battle-field. Demosthenes ran from the Macedonians at Chæroneia; for,

after defeat was inevitable, the Athenians, unlike the Spartans, considered it proper to run if necessary to save life. If, however, the Athenian had not bravely kept his place in the ranks, so long as there was a reasonable hope of success, he would have had little influence over his fellow-citizens. They never elected a notorious coward to high office. Before reaching his twentieth year, when the Athenian citizen was sent away from home upon his first serious military duty, which was to be performed even in time of peace, he took this oath:—

“I will never disgrace these hallowed weapons, or abandon my comrade beside whom I am placed, and I will fight for both sacred and common things personally and with my fellows. I will not leave my country less but greater and better by sea and land than I have received it. I will obey the rulers for the time being, and obey the established laws and whatsoever others the commonwealth may agree to establish, and if anyone abolish the ordinances or disobey them, I will not allow it, but will defend them personally and with the rest. I will obey the established religion. Be my witnesses, Aglauros, Enyalios, Ares, Zeus, Thollo, Auxo, Hegemone.”¹

We must not think of the ancient Greek as we do of the average modern soldier. He was not obtained by enlistment from the dissipated, the incompetent, or the lazy classes, as in England or America; nor, as often in Germany and France, was he without property, knowledge of his rulers, or strong personal interest in the result of the war. He was not an unknown and unimportant unit in an army of millions. He was one of a few all known to each other. He could not emigrate. He would spend all his life among those who stood by

his side in the ranks and knew how he behaved. He belonged to a privileged class. High offices and honors were within his reach, if he fought well; and on the other hand, certain and lifelong disgrace would punish any pusillanimous weakness. Such influences served to develop character; and the frequent dangerous emergencies to which the Athenians were exposed gave them opportunities to show their capacity and to gain reputations that would enable them to reach the highest offices of the state.

If the cities of Greece had united their forces about 440 b. c. in a durable and harmonious confederacy, they could have conquered the known world and thus have anticipated Macedon and Rome, which then were insignificant states. And a conquest under the intellectual leadership of Athens, with the aid of Sparta, Thebes, and Corinth, would have been far more advantageous to culture, and far more generous to its subjects, than were the later dominions of the Macedonians and the Romans. The Athenians had a high capacity for every department of political organization and administration; and with their arms and dominion they might have established such a literature, art, and philosophy as Macedon and Rome never approached. But the Greeks could not combine their states in any union or confederation; and the result was that they were conquered, plundered, deprived of political power, and reduced to insignificance in literature and art. All these evils overtook them because they would not give up their separate city governments.

Athens and Sparta were not only the most powerful cities during the best part of Grecian history, but they were also distinguished above the other states by the

consistency of their policy and the ability which they showed in its support. Thebes was great for about ten years; Corinth and Argos never were great; the Achaean and Ætolian leagues did not show their power till after the rise of Macedon.

Although decidedly inferior to the Spartans in drill, and in confidence in one another while fighting on land, the Athenian soldiers usually encountered other enemies as if sure of success, and not unfrequently they faced even the Spartans with unflinching tenacity, either conquering or dying with face to the foe. One of the notable cases of this kind occurred in 447 b. c. at Tanagra, in Boeotia, where the Lacedæmonians defeated the Athenians. On the eve of the battle, Cimon, who was then an exile, under a decree of ostracism, applied to the Athenian commander for leave to fight as a common soldier for his country. His request was denied, and "in departing he conjured his personal friends, Euthippus and others, to behave in such a manner as might wipe away the stain resting upon his fidelity, and in part also upon theirs. His friends retained his panoply, and assigned it to the station in the ranks which he would himself have occupied; they then entered the engagement with desperate resolution, and one hundred of them fell side by side in the ranks."²

As compared with the rule of other ancient empires, that of Athens over her subjects was just and generous. Indeed, no other dominion over distant provinces before the XVIIIth century ever was so liberal. It was "founded in a spirit of justice, regulated by legal statutes, and organized with intelligence; it treated the individual life of each community with as much tenderness as the interests of the leading state permitted; it offered

a strong protection . . . under which trade and industry might flourish; and it possessed a national significance which no judge could fail to perceive."³

After lasting nearly half a century, it broke up under a combination of many causes, among which were the lack of a system of representation, the aversion of the ancient Greeks to any extensive political union, the folly of the governments in the smaller cities, the abuses in the Athenian courts, the supposition that the Persians could never again conquer Greek cities, and, perhaps most potent of all, the irritation created by the great development of the shipping and manufactures of Athens, enabling her to underbid all rivals, including her subject and rival cities, in many articles of commerce.

"Athens was the most illustrious of Greek states . . . as a Pan-Hellenic leader against the barbarian. In the latter character at least she stands unrivaled. When Croesus subdued the Ionic cities, Sparta was the ally of the first barbarian who bore rule over Greeks. When the same cities revolted against Darius, Athens fought by their side in the first Greek war of independence. During the great Persian war, Athens was the one Grecian city whose endurance never failed for a moment. While Northern Greece fought on the side of the invader, while Peloponnesus thought of Peloponnesian interests alone, Athens never flinched, never faltered. Her fields were harried; her city was destroyed; the most favorable terms of submission were offered to her; but neither fear nor hope moved her for a moment. She rose far above that local jealousy which was the common bane of Hellas. When her contingent was two-thirds of the whole fleet, she cheerfully gave up the command to a Lacedæmonian landsman. On the field

of Platæa, the victors of Marathon were ready to yield the place of honor to the presumptuous pretensions of Tegea. Athens, more than any other state, drove back the invader from Greece itself; Athens, without any help from the mainland, carried a triumphant war into his own territory. She freed the Ægean from the presence of barbarian fleets, and the Greeks of Asia from the presence of barbarian tribute-gatherers."⁴

Very different from this was the conduct of Sparta and Thebes. The latter city indeed, under her aristocracy, not only always accepted readily, but seemed to desire, the Persian domination. Sparta, it is true, often fought against Asiatic sovereigns, but at other times sought their alliance. When Croesus ruled despotically over the Ionic cities of Asia Minor, he had aid and comfort from Sparta; and when, after the Peloponnesian war, Artaxerxes II. re-established the Persian dominion over the Hellenic cities in Asia, Sparta stood by his side, and became his agent in communicating and enforcing his orders in Greece. And at a still later date, when Philip of Macedon threatened to overthrow the independence of the Hellenic republics, Sparta, though bitterly opposed to him, would not co-operate with Athens and Thebes. To her they were more hateful than barbarism.

SEC. 384. *Peloponnesian War.*—After the danger of Persian oppression seemed to have passed away, after Athens had become a successful competitor in commerce and manufactures with many of her subject states, and after the plunder of wealthy citizens of these states, by sycophantic prosecution in the Athenian courts, had become common and notorious, the discontent became so great that the enemies of Athens saw that their time for revenge had come.

In 432 b. c. Sparta, Thebes, and Corinth formed an alliance for her overthrow, and they were aided by many other states of less importance. For twenty-eight years they fought with varying fortunes. The basis of Athens was not broad enough to support the superstructure of her empire. She was rich, and offered an immense amount of spoil to her conquerors. She was proud, and her pre-eminence, as well as her democracy, offended Sparta. By becoming the great center of commerce and manufacture, she provoked the envy and hatred of Corinth, Megara, and many other cities. She had liberated Plataea from the Boeotian dominion, and thus provoked the intense animosity of Thebes. While she was powerful, the other leading states of Greece could easily agree among themselves. All other considerations of foreign policy were subordinate to their hatred and envy of Athens.

While her empire was maintained, she found it necessary to devote most of her energies to her navy. This was the instrument of her power; and the branch of the war department in which she excelled. On the sea her sailors had a pre-eminence like that of Spartan hoplites on land. Their superior drill and efficiency were unquestioned. Equality of number meant certain and easy victory for them in conflict with any enemy. They sought to do as much as possible of their fighting at sea; and their enemies sought to decide the matter on land.

The Spartans and their allies invaded Attica repeatedly, cut down its fruit trees and vines, destroyed its villages and country houses, drove away its cattle, and challenged the Athenians to come out of their walls. Year after year these invasions were repeated; and year

after year the Athenian fleets ravaged the shores of the allied states, and destroyed their trade. Fortune was fickle, and each side sought peace several times, and truces were made, but hostilities soon broke out again, and finally in 404 b. c. Athens was exhausted and vanquished. The main cause of her fall was the loss in war of most of the men of her old families. The government fell into the hands of officials, many of whom had neither experience, character, nor capacity.

The number of Athenian soldiers and sailors slain or enslaved by enemies between 465 and 400 b. c. was about 174,000, and of these perhaps 30,000 were citizens, an immense loss for a state which never had more than 20,000 adult male citizens at any one time. Two expeditions, comprising altogether two hundred and fifty triremes or war ships with 50,000 men, went to Egypt in the year 460 b. c. and the five succeeding years, and of these men none returned. Of the 60,000 soldiers, sailors, and camp followers sent to Syracuse in 422 b. c. and the six succeeding years, nearly all were slain or enslaved. At Ægospotami in 405 b. c., the Athenian fleet had one hundred and eighty triremes and 36,000 men, of whom few escaped. In the sea fights at Eretria, Notium, Arginusæ, and Mitylene, the loss of the Athenians amounted to about 18,000 men; and in the land battles at Tanagra, Ænophyta, Delium, Sphacteria, Amphipolis, Mantinea, and in minor skirmishes, the losses may be estimated at 10,000 men. These losses in the Peloponnesian war amounted in the aggregate to 174,000 men, of whom five-sixths may have been allies and aliens.

In a period of thirty years, beginning in 445 b. c., the Athenians established numerous colonies, in most cases

after expelling or enslaving the previous inhabitants of conquered districts. Ægina, Lemnos, Imbros, and portions of Eubœa were depopulated to make room for inhabitants whose fidelity to Athens could be trusted; and for this purpose many of the new settlers must be of Athenian blood; and each of these colonies took presumably at least two thousand men. In these cases we must depend on presumption for the number, precise information not being obtainable. To the Thracian Chersonesus we are told that one thousand settlers were sent, and as many to Potidaea. In Mitylene, twenty-seven hundred lots were distributed; but whether the grantees were required to be residents is not stated. Probably they were, since the place was to be held as a conquered province, the former landholders and their families being reduced to slavery. Amphipolis was colonized a second time in 437 b. c. with an unknown number of settlers. The first colony, established thirty years earlier, when the place was called Ennea Hodoi, had 10,000 settlers, mostly allies of Athens; and all were slain or enslaved by the Thracians. The large number of the first colony, and its inability to defend itself, suggest the probability that the second one was not insignificant in number. Thurii in Italy near the site of the ancient Sybaris was another Athenian colony that required a considerable military strength from the start, though most of the settlers were not of Athenian blood. Naxos, Andros, Scyros, and Melos were islands that received new sets of inhabitants from Athens. The total number of settlers contributed by that city to her colonies during those thirty years was probably 10,000, from the body of her own citizens, without counting those volunteers, who never had a share in the govern-

ment of the mother city though they were admitted to the franchise and to the ownership of land in the colony.

Besides the citizens taken from Athens by warfare and colonization in the sixty-five years before 400 B. C., we must make allowance for at least one thousand victims of the great plague, in the third year of the Peloponnesian war, and for two thousand others secretly assassinated or openly condemned and executed by the oligarchs, who held power for short periods before the city surrendered to her enemies. The total number of citizens, according to the census taken at the beginning of the war, was only 14,000, but under the rules proposed by Pericles at that time six thousand men who had claimed citizenship were placed on the list of aliens.

In general terms, we may say that in the sixty years preceding the close of the Peloponnesian war, Athens lost in battle in each generation nearly as many adult male citizens as she ever had at any one time. The Athenians enslaved, were usually as completely lost as if they had been slain. Most of them were sold to Phœnician or other slave dealers, and were either taken to distant barbarous lands, or were kept as oarsmen of war ships, to which they were not unfrequently chained.

These great losses of Athenian soldiers within the limits of a century were unexampled in Hellenic history. No Greek city save Athens could have supplied men to replace the vacancies. She alone had a custom of naturalization,—not a law to confer citizenship on every resident alien who abjured his native allegiance, but a habit of frequently naturalizing a number of aliens by special act of the assembly. This policy, established by

Solon, and imitated repeatedly afterwards at times of which no record was kept, not only supplied faithful sailors and soldiers to the fleet and army, but it attracted to Athens men of enterprise and capital, who saw opportunities there for a happier life and a more profitable business than they could have found in their native cities.

No other Greek city undertook naval and military enterprises so vast and so numerous in proportion to her population. As adventurous invasions of distant lands, her expeditions to Egypt and to Syracuse had never previously been equaled among the Greeks. It was her custom to keep several fleets and numerous small naval detachments in constant service during the milder seasons of the year, even in times when there was no war or expectation of any special trouble. The large number of men in the public service was accompanied by a large loss.

In 412 b. c., when Athens was greatly enfeebled by the loss of a large fleet and army at Syracuse, by the predominance of the Spartans in the *Ægean Sea*, by the destruction of her commerce, and by the devastation of all the rural districts of Attica, word was sent by some of her generals to her assembly, that if she would adopt an aristocratic government, she could obtain liberal pecuniary aid from Persia, which was then the ally of Sparta, and enough to enable her to recover her lost ground. This statement was presented in a manner so plausible, and was backed up by such an array of testimony, that the people in their distress listened to it with a show of favor until they were tricked into the appointment of a council of four hundred, who pretended that they represented five thousand wealthy men. This

council, however, represented nothing but themselves, and, after ruling despotically for about eight months, was overthrown to make way for the re-established democracy.

When finally exhausted, and compelled to surrender her fleet, her arms, and her public treasure; deprived of her commerce and her colonies; placed at the mercy of her enemies by the overthrow of her walls; impoverished by the devastation of her territory; and then made subject in 404 b. c. to the rule of thirty despotic oligarchs, it seemed as if Athens would need at least a century to recover her prosperity. But her conquerors quarreled among themselves, and could not agree as to the manner of further interference with the vanquished city. The Athenians expelled the tyrants, restored their democratic constitution, rebuilt their walls, constructed a new navy, regained much of their lost trade, and within fifteen years after their surrender again defied Sparta, and gave her serious defeats on sea and land. To do all this she must have admitted numerous aliens to her citizenship; but of the times and conditions of the later extensions of her franchise we have no information. For more than two centuries after the Peloponnesian war she was a prosperous commercial city, and for seven centuries she remained the chief seat of literature and education in Greece; but her government never regained the greatness that it had in the half century after the battle of Salamis.

After the Peloponnesian war, though much valuable literary work was done, the decline of Greece in its industrial and intellectual condition was rapid and almost uninterrupted. Warfare was continuous, destructive, and demoralizing. The organization of mercenary bands to serve any master who would pay them became an es-

tablished custom. Persian satraps, Sicilian despots, and the commanders of Spartan expeditions in Asia, were preferred employers. The most energetic young men went abroad as soldiers or traders. Their places were taken by freedmen of barbarian blood and of base traditions. Every generation witnessed the destruction of some notable Greek city, and the extermination or final dispersion of its people.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THEBES, MACEDON, ETC.

SECTION 385. *Epaminondas.*—The triumph of Sparta was brief. She treated the cities that had belonged to the Athenian empire with so little regard for their feelings and their substantial rights, and she tolerated in the commanders of her garrisons and fleets so much cruelty, so much plunder, and so much disregard of social propriety, that within five years, her allies plainly indicated their regret for the part they had taken in helping her against Athens. She understood that if there were another war, they would rather fight against than for her. When the Athenians began to rebuild their walls and to reorganize their navy, she did not dare to interfere.

Nominally the victor in the Peloponnesian war, she really suffered greater damage relatively than she inflicted on her rival. Her losses of men in battle were small in comparison with the slaughter of the Athenians; but were felt with more severity; because her constitution lacked elasticity. It did not permit the admission of new men into the governing class. If a noble died without a male heir of noble blood, the basis of the state was permanently diminished; and thus the number of those capable of holding office had shriveled in 400 B. C. to one-half of what it was in 500 B. C.

For their success in the Peloponnesian war, they were largely indebted to Thebes, which had a large force

of excellent infantry and cavalry, and never had produced a general or statesman of much note. The influence of that city in Greece was, therefore, small as compared with its military power for defensive purposes. The Spartans thought they could treat Thebes without respect, and in a treacherous manner they seized her citadel and held it. This insulting tyranny of the Spartan garrison having become unendurable, the Thebans revolted, expelled the intruders, and defied Sparta, taking for leaders two of their fellow-citizens, Epaminondas and Pelopidas, the most remarkable pair of statesmen in all history. Each possessed high political capacity, distinguished military genius, unfaltering courage, zealous patriotism, and the most unselfish devotion to the interests of the other. Epaminondas was the abler man of the two, at least Pelopidas insisted that he was, and that he must take the more responsible positions; to which, besides, he was entitled by his higher talent as an orator. It was also his fortune to outlive his associate, and to command in the two battles which rendered Thebes the greatest military power of his time. At Leuctra, in 371 b. c., and at Mantinea nine years later, the Thebans under Epaminondas defeated the Spartans in pitched battles, the greatest defeats the Spartans ever suffered. In the last battle Epaminondas was slain, and Pelopidas having previously fallen a victim to his adventurous courage, Thebes was left without a leader, and she immediately sank back into her former insignificance.

When Sparta became the ruling state of Greece, the Hellenic cities of the Ægean islands and Asia Minor soon found that they had not improved their condition by change of masters. Athens taxed them heavily, but otherwise treated them with respectful fairness; Sparta

plundered, insulted, and crushed them. Although the influence of Athens tended to give political power to the freemen generally, there was little interference with the form of government, unless in cases of special provocation. On the other hand, Sparta never spared the democracy, and insisted upon many changes in local administration. Athens and Sparta were both severe at times, but the severity of the latter was much harsher than that of the former. After the Spartans had been defeated by Epaminondas, the Athenian confederacy was reorganized with the glad participation of the subordinate cities generally; but the result did not prove satisfactory to them. The Athenian people had been demoralized by the Peloponnesian war. Their officials were inferior in character and capacity to the contemporaries of Aristides and Pericles; the troops were mostly mercenaries; and the generals were often left without means to pay their troops, so that they were compelled to exact heavy contributions from subject cities, or to undertake plundering expeditions in neutral or hostile territory. The subject cities, growing tired of this system of management, revolted; and war followed, which prepared Greece for submission to Macedon.¹

Soon after the close of the Peloponnesian war, the Spartans sent an army into Asia Minor mainly for the purpose of plunder, and thus greatly irritated the Persians, who then, considering Athens as the best check of their enemy, gave a considerable sum of money to the Athenians to assist them in rebuilding their walls; but as the Athenians did little in return, and as the Spartans were soon ready to leave the Greek cities in Asia Minor and in the *Aegean* archipelago without protection, Artaxerxes made a treaty with them in 387 b. c.—the

treaty of Antalcidas, as it is known in history—by which the Asiatic Greeks were delivered over to the barbarian dominion, and Sparta was made the chief ally and agent of Persia in Europe, with authority to dictate the boundaries of the different states, but not to interfere in their government. Sparta retained authority over her subject cities, but Thebes did not.

SEC. 386. *Timolcon.*—Nearly all the important contributions to culture made by the Hellens before the rise of Macedon had their origin in Greece proper. Though the colonies had more people and more wealth, they copied the institutions, arts, and literature of Athens and the Peloponnesus. The only notable improvement made in polity by any of the colonies was the adoption of written laws, the substance and phraseology of which have not been preserved. Many distinguished Hellenic thinkers and writers had their birth in Sicily, Italy, and Asia Minor, but either their work was fragmentary or did not amount to much until they had been aided and encouraged at Athens.

Of all the colonial cities, the greatest in population, wealth, commerce, social refinement, and military power, was Syracuse, which, in the VIth century B. C., followed the example of Athens in adopting a democratic form of government, but did not succeed in maintaining it for any long period. The freemen as a body being incompetent to perform properly their political duties, became the victims of despots, who, as a class, are the most remarkable in history for their capacity. The first of these, Gelon, who ascended the throne in 491 B. C. and reigned thirteen years, was distinguished for the liberality of his rule and the great power to which he raised his state. Having been solicited to send assistance to

Greece after Xerxes had crossed the Hellespont, he consented to furnish 66,000 men with arms and ships, on condition that he should have command of the forces either on the land or the sea. Sparta would not surrender her hoplites nor Athens her ships to his control, and he remained at home; where he soon had to encounter a Carthaginian army of 300,000 men. At Himera—on the very day of Salamis, according to report—he defeated them, and left half their number dead on the field. His brother Hiero succeeded him and ruled for ten years, with less kindness, but with rare capacity.

The next Syracusan despot of much note was Dionysius I., whose reign of forty-two years ended in 367 b. c. He had a large standing army of mercenaries, said to number 100,000 men, and was engaged in numerous wars, in which he was generally successful. He conquered much of Southern Italy, destroyed the Italian cities of Rhegium, Caulonia, and Hipponium, subdued Crotona, and checked the advance of the Carthaginians in Sicily. He was a liberal patron of literature and literary men, and induced Plato to pay him a visit, but took offense at the language of the philosopher, and sold him as a slave.

Dionysius I. was succeeded by his son Dionysius II., who had little character or capacity, and yet retained possession of the throne for many years. At first he accepted the direction of his uncle, the philosopher Dion, who induced Plato to visit Syracuse a second time, and the two, acting in concert, hoped to lead the monarch to establish something like constitutional government, but he refused to submit to their influence, exiled Dion, treated Plato with neglect, and for his advisers selected

men who conducted the administration on despotic principles.

The people, discontented with a sovereign who gave them all the evils of despotism without any of the brilliancy which had adorned their city under Gelon, Hiero and Dionysius I., sent word to Dion that they wanted him to aid them in throwing off the yoke of his nephew. He accepted the invitation and succeeded; but instead of establishing a democratic or aristocratic constitution, he assumed despotic power, intending to rule liberally. On many occasions he showed great magnanimity and strong detestation of cruel measures. But he was assassinated before he could carry out his plan, and then for nine years the government remained without a competent head. Dionysius II. regained possession of the citadel, so that the city was in danger of the re-establishment of his tyranny. The Carthaginians, finding no formidable enemy opposed to them in Sicily, made such rapid progress in their conquests that the Greeks feared they would soon be reduced to complete subjection, or driven from the island.

While Dionysius II. had possession of the fortress of Syracuse, and while the people of that city were trying to expel him, Hycetas, the Greek despot of Leontini, made an alliance with the Carthaginians for the conquest of Syracuse and the division of its spoils. They accordingly laid siege to the city, which, then, in 344 B. C., sent an embassy to Corinth, their mother city, soliciting military aid. The Corinthian assembly of nobles—the government was an aristocracy—determined to send some help; but so little, that the enterprise was generally not only hopeless but foolhardy. Most of the citizens of reputation refused to be associated with it in any manner.

They evidently feared the blame that would attach to probable failure.

The expedition fitted out was to consist of seven triremes, filled with mercenary hoplites who had a bad reputation—only twenty-four hundred men in all. The command was offered to a dozen different men, who refused. Finally it was offered to Timoleon, who accepted it, and soon proved himself pre-eminently fitted for the place. He belonged to a noble family, and had distinguished himself on the battle-field by a heroic rescue of his wounded brother, Timophanes, who was afterwards intrusted with the command of the citadel and its garrison of mercenaries. Taking advantage of his position and of his control over the garrison, Timophanes assumed despotic power and exercised it tyrannically. His brother, brother-in-law, and a friend went to the citadel to expostulate with him, and finding him determined to maintain his tyranny, they slew him. Timoleon did not raise his hand against Timophanes but by his presence and silent consent he encouraged the executioners. His mother, who was proud of her despot son, cursed Timoleon, and he became unhappy and solitary. He was ready to face any danger at the call of his country. Death had lost its terrors for him. Immediately after accepting command of the Sicilian expedition, he devoted himself to the preparations, and set sail as soon as possible. Coreyra and Lesbos supplied three additional galleys; and with their crews he had three thousand two hundred men in all, including twelve hundred hoplites. He found a large Carthaginian fleet besieging Syracuse with the aid of Hyrcetas. To reach the shores of Sicily in defiance of a large fleet watching to intercept him required courage and cunning.

Both of these were his, and he landed. But he could not reach Syracuse, and his army being small as compared with that of either Hycetas or the Carthaginians, he started for the interior town of Adranum. Hycetas, earning his purpose and being nearer, determined to anticipate him, but Timoleon, with an inferior force, surprised and defeated him, and then, having obtained a supply of arms and attracted recruits from the surrounding country, he ventured to approach Syracuse. There, to his surprise, a messenger visited him from Dionysius II., who still held the citadel against the city as well as against the besiegers, proposing to surrender it in return for a conveyance to Corinth and a promise of protection there. Timoleon accepted the offer, and obtained possession of the citadel with two thousand mercenaries, an immense stock of military supplies, and access to the city which he had come to protect. The citizens and the arms gave him at once a formidable army. The dethroned despot was taken to Corinth, and there he lived many years as a poor teacher, a wonder to the citizens and strangers.

Timoleon was preparing to assail the besiegers when suddenly the Carthaginians disappeared. They had observed that at intervals between the skirmishes the soldiers of Hycetas and Timoleon were on friendly terms, which might mean serious danger to themselves in case of a general encounter. Hycetas saw that without Carthaginian aid he could not take Syracuse, so he decamped. Having driven away the foreign enemies, Timoleon immediately demolished the citadel, to show that he had no intention to become a despot. Thus he gained the confidence of all Greeks at home and abroad. Many of the people of the city and its surrounding country

having been slain in the previous fifteen years, Timoleon issued an invitation to immigrants, of whom 60,000 came, and all were provided with homes. The Carthaginians continued to oppress some of the Greek districts in the interior of the island, so Timoleon went to their aid; with 12,000 men at Crimesus he attacked and defeated an army of 70,000, of whom he slew 10,000 and captured 15,000. This victory stopped the Punic aggression in Sicily for that generation. Within a few months, and with means that were at first almost absurdly small for the task before him, he had advanced from victory to victory, until he had achieved very great results.

Having secured peace and order to Syracuse and to the Sicilian Greeks generally, and having seen that democratic government was established in all their cities, Timoleon resigned his position of general and refused to accept any office. One cause of his retirement was his failing vision; he soon became entirely blind. But so long as he lived, he was treated with the veneration due to his eminent services and his admirable character.

“By refusing the official prominence tendered to him, and by keeping away from the details of public life, Timoleon escaped the jealousy sure to attend upon influence so prodigious as his. But in truth, for all great and important matters, this very modesty increased instead of diminishing his real ascendancy. Though the Syracusans transacted their ordinary business through others, yet, when any matter of serious difficulty occurred, the presence of Timoleon was specially invoked in the discussion. During the latter months of his life, when he had become blind, his arrival in the assembly was a solemn scene. Having been brought in his car drawn by

mules across the market-place to the door of the theatre wherein the assembly was held, attendants then led or drew the car into the theatre amidst the assembled people, who testified their affection by the warmest shouts and congratulations. As soon as he had returned their welcome, and silence was restored, the discussion to which he had been invited took place, Timoleon sitting in his car and listening. Having heard the matter thus debated, he delivered his own opinion, which was usually ratified at once by the show of hands of the assembly. He then took leave of the people and retired, the attendants again leading the car out of the theatre, and the same cheers of attachment accompanying his departure; while the assembly proceeded with its other and more ordinary business. Such is the impressive and picturesque description given (doubtless by Athanis or some other eyewitness) of the relations between the Syracusan people and the blind Timoleon, after his power had been abdicated, and when there remained to him nothing except his character and moral ascendancy. Timoleon now enjoyed, as he had amply earned, what Xenophon calls ‘that good, not human, but divine—command over willing men—given manifestly to persons of genuine and highly trained temperance of character.’ In him the condition indicated by Xenophon was found completely realized—temperance in the largest and most comprehensive sense of the word—not simply sobriety and continence, but an absence of that fatal thirst for coercive power at all price, which in Greece was the fruitful parent of the greater crimes and enormities.

“ Timoleon lived to see his great work of Sicilian enfranchisement consummated. Not Syracuse alone, but

the other Grecian cities in the island also, enjoyed under their revived free institutions a state of security, comfort, and affluence to which they had long been strangers. There are few names among the Grecian annals with which we can connect so large an amount of predetermined and beneficent results. Unfortunately for the Syracusans Timoleon died in the year 337-336 b. c.—three or four years after the battle of the Crimesus (eight years after he landed in Sicily). Profound and unfeigned was the sorrow which his death excited throughout Sicily. Not merely the Syracusans, but crowds from all other parts of the island, attended to do honor at his funeral, which was splendidly celebrated at the public cost. Some of the chosen youths of the city carried the bier whereon his body was deposited; a countless procession of men and women followed, in their festival attire, crowned with wreaths, and mingling with their tears admiration and envy for their departed liberator. The procession was made to pass over the ground which presented the most honorable mementoes of Timoleon; where the demolished Dionysian stronghold had once reared its head, and where the court of justice was now placed, at the entrance of Ortygia [the citadel]. At length it reached the necropolis, between Ortygia and Achradina, where a massive funeral pile had been prepared. As soon as the bier had been placed on this pile and fire was about to be applied, the herald Demetrius, distinguished for the powers of his voice, proclaimed with loud announcement as follows:—

“ ‘The Syracusan people solemnize at the cost of two hundred minæ the funeral of this man, the Corinthian Timoleon, son of Timodemus. They have passed a vote to honor him for all future time with festival matches in

music, horse and chariot race, and gymnastics—because, after having put down the despots, subdued the foreign enemy, and recolonized the greatest among the ruined cities, he restored to the Sicilian Greeks their constitution and laws.'

"A sepulchral monument, seemingly with this inscription recorded on it, was erected to the memory of Timoleon in the agora of Syracuse. To this monument other buildings were presently annexed; porticos for the assembling of persons in business or conversation, and palæstræ for the exercises of youths. The aggregate of buildings all taken together was called the Timoleontion."¹

Timoleon is one of the most admirable statesmen of all time, a worthy companion in the pantheon of history for his predecessors, Solon, Aristides, Pericles, and Epaminondas. These five are pre-eminent for greatness in character combined with greatness in capacity and achievement above all the other men of antiquity who attained distinction in political life. Themistocles was superior to some of these in capacity and achievement, but serious doubts, not sustained by satisfactory proof, have been thrown on his integrity. All were democrats; all were pupils of Athens, where the first three were born and where they lived. Of the other two, one belonged to Thebes and the other to Corinth.

SEC. 387. *Philip*.—When Epaminondas was at the head of the Theban government, a Macedonian boy prince named Philip was taken to Thebes as a hostage. There he was kept until he became a man, and was educated in a manner befitting his rank, with excellent opportunities to study the statesmanship and military discipline of a highly civilized state. While he was in Thebes, his elder brother, Perdiccas, succeeded to the

throne, and after a reign of five years was slain in war, leaving as heir an infant son. Philip claimed the regency, and after fighting against foreign and domestic enemies, established his authority, and then, superseding his nephew, Amyntas, assumed the title of king in 359 B. C.

His realm was the largest and most populous of the Greek states, having an area of nearly three thousand square miles, about double the size of the Peloponnesus, Attica, and Boeotia combined. When he began his reign, his subjects were considered barbarians by the other Greeks. The difference in dialect was sufficient to render the speech of the Macedonian unintelligible to the Athenian, but, nevertheless, the two tongues were nearly related; and in the next generation the Macedonians were recognized as of true Hellenic blood. The people were so rude and their government so weak that they had never exercised any influence outside of their own borders; but already in the Vth century they had begun to attract Athenian teachers, and had even induced Euripides to live among them. Their country was rich in agricultural, commercial, and mineral resources; and with the internal security given by the strong reign of Philip, the people rapidly advanced in wealth. The state had some silver mines which in previous reigns had yielded little, but to him gave 1,000,000 ounces annually; a very large revenue, when an ounce of precious metal was worth relatively at least ten times as much as now.

Having established peace at home and beaten the Epirots so that they understood that they must not make inroads into Macedonia, he began to extend his authority over Greece, interfering in their quarrels, in

such a manner that he used some as allies against others. His chief ambition was to conquer Persia; and he could not venture to leave Europe until he was certain that the Greeks would not attack his country during his absence. To obtain that certainty he must become the recognized head of all Greece. He demanded not tribute nor abject submission, but co-operation, or at least neutrality.

The idea of the Greek conquest of Persia had already taken definite shape about 400 B. C., after the Greek mercenaries who accompanied Cyrus the Younger to the Euphrates fought their way out of the country. They numbered 13,000 men when they started from the shores of the *Ægean* Sea; before their retreat began, they had been reduced to about 10,000, and when they reached the Black Sea, to six thousand. In company with 80,000 Asiatics they met the army of Artaxerxes, said to number 900,000 men, at Cunaxa and defeated it, or rather the Greeks defeated it, for the Asiatic associates contributed little to the result. But Cyrus was slain in the battle, and as his death made an end to their purpose as well as to their pay, they had nothing to do but return. The Persians pursued and attempted to destroy them, but completely failed. The retreat took a north-westward direction, and was a succession of fights for about a thousand miles, until the shore of the Black Sea was reached. Xenophon, who was one of the commanders during the retreat, wrote a most interesting account of it, and in his book said that "Persia belongs to the man who has the courage to attack it." He distinctly saw that the discipline and strategy of the Greeks were vastly superior to those of any Asiatics that he had met, and that the combined troops of two or three of the

largest Greek states could overcome all the armies of the Persian empire.

The balance of power was well understood and frequently made the basis of foreign policy by Greek statesmen. They habitually combined their forces to prevent any one strong state from gaining a great preponderance; and they protected the small cities, which at some future time might be valuable as allies. Before Leuctra the Athenians indirectly aided the Thebans, who were considered the weaker party; but after that battle, they sent an army to the succor of the Spartans. It was upon this principle of the balance of power that Demosthenes acted in urging his countrymen to attack Macedon before Philip should become irresistible; and, in accordance with their habitual policy, they doubtless would have accepted this advice when first given, if then they had believed the danger as serious as their great orator told them it was and as time proved it to be.

As a barbarian and a despot, Philip was hateful to the Greeks, and to none more so than to the Athenians, whose state now again occupied a leading position, and who finally understood that the rise of Macedon meant the fall of several Athenian colonies on the Macedonian coast. Soon after Philip's accession to the throne, Demosthenes saw that Philip had the capacity and the ambition to raise his country to a controlling influence in Hellenic affairs, and that unless Athens should act energetically, she must soon sink into a subordinate position. His fellow-citizens listened to him and encouraged him in his denunciations of Philip, but at the same time, when they had the superior power, they did nothing. They applauded Demosthenes and gave him office, but allowed the Macedonian king to pursue his plans and or-

ganize his military forces. While Demosthenes was thus active on one side, his policy was opposed by Phocion, a statesman of incorruptible integrity, of extensive experience in public affairs, and of much influence as a public speaker, though his speeches were usually very short. After Demosthenes had delivered one of his great orations, and had produced a strong effect on his auditors, a few words from Phocion were sufficient to change completely the dominant opinion. Phocion took the ground that Athens was not strong enough to resist Philip; and that she could gain more by encouraging than by opposing him. There was no reason to doubt the sincerity of Philip's declaration that he wanted to invade Persia; nor was there any good reason why the Greeks generally should not aid him in his enterprise. It was not to be supposed that his main purpose was to plunder Greece while Persia was within reach; they might as well assume that wolves would attack dogs in preference to sheep. Year after year Phocion defeated Demosthenes in the assembly, but finally the Athenians determined to resist Philip, and they induced the Thebans to join them in their war. Their combined army met the Macedonians on the field of Chæroneia, in 338 b. c., and was defeated. The alliance was crushed, and resistance to Philip was at an end.

He placed a Macedonian garrison in Thebes, and took away much of her subject territory; but he treated Athens with indulgence. He exacted no tribute from her; imposed no garrison on her; allowed her to retain her constitution, and the rulers of her choice, and did not punish or silence Demosthenes, who, for fourteen years, had been his bitter and unrelenting enemy. Philip requested Athens and the other states of Greece to be his

allies in an expedition for the conquest of Persia; and in a congress which he called, and in which all the states save Sparta were represented, it was decreed by unanimous vote that each should furnish a certain number of soldiers or sailors with ships, to be ready at some time in the future in accordance with a notice to be sent by the head of the alliance.

SEC. 388. *Alexander*.—Two years after this congress and before Philip could make his final arrangements for the Persian expedition, he was assassinated. His son Alexander, then twenty years of age, succeeded to the throne and soon began to carry out the plan of his father. Crossing the Hellespont with 30,000 infantry and five thousand cavalry in 334 b. c., the second year of his reign, he marched through Asia Minor, where he won two important battles. Thence he marched to Syria, Phœnicia, and Egypt, which countries he subdued. Having established his authority over those portions of the Persian empire bordering on the Mediterranean Sea, he went on to the valley of the Euphrates, where he gained the last of his great victories at Arbela, in 331 b. c., three years and a half after he crossed from Europe to Asia. After this time no Persian army met him in the field, and no Persian city refused to open its gates to him. The empire, however, was very extensive, and he spent six years in military expeditions to eastern Persia, Bactria, Afghanistan, the valley of the Indus, and Beloochistan. In 323 b. c. he returned to Babylon, which he made his capital, and there, two years later, he died at the age of thirty-three. He was the first of the great conquerors in time, and in many respects the most eminent of all. In area, his conquests far surpassed those of his most distinguished rivals, Cæsar and Napoleon; and his

influence on culture was much more extensive and more lasting than theirs.

For ten years he reigned over a vast empire in Asia, and in that time he gave it an impress which it retained for centuries. He established Greek cities protected by fortifications in Mesopotamia, Afghanistan, Bactria, and India; and he made Athenian Greek the language of his government. He treated the Asiatics as political equals of his other subjects. He enlisted them in his army; and appointed them to political office. He encouraged his officers and soldiers to marry Asiatic women. He intended to melt together the different nationalities in his dominion; and though his work was only begun when he died, it nevertheless exercised a great and long enduring influence. His empire soon fell to pieces; one general becoming king of Macedonia, another of Persia including Asia Minor, and a third of Egypt. It seems rather singular that this last kingdom, which was the farthest from Greece in its geographical and ethnographical position, should have become the chief representative of Greek culture. For two centuries the leading city in Greek literature and science was Alexandria.

In the course of the century preceding the reign of Alexander, some additions were made to the implements of warfare. Machines (catapults and ballistas) were invented to throw heavy javelins and stones weighing as much as three hundred pounds to a distance of half a mile.¹ Battering rams had been used from remote times, but under Alexander were made more efficient by suspending them from frames by chains, or by supporting them on wheels, so that they could be made heavier and thrust forward with greater momentum. Towers, some

of them one hundred and fifty feet high, were built to move on rollers, so that they could be brought into contact with the fortifications of besieged cities. Walls were undermined, and walls of earth were thrown up against them, so that the assailants could be on a level with the defenders. With these improvements, the defense of fortified cities became much more difficult.

Philip armed his heavy infantry with a spear twenty-one feet long, loaded at the butt, so that five feet at that end were as heavy as sixteen at the other. His line of battle for the hoplites was made in files sixteen deep. The five ranks in front carried their spears level; the other ranks carried theirs pointing up at an angle of about thirty degrees. Except in the length of the spear, the Macedonian hoplite had about the same arms and armor as the Spartan or Athenian.

In open plains and for meeting an enemy directly in front, especially if the enemy was cavalry, the Macedonian phalanx armed with the long spear was an excellent organization; but it lacked flexibility, and therefore was not copied by other nations. It could not readily change front nor preserve its order in defiles or timber, nor fight well on broken ground or in small squads. It never achieved a notable triumph over Greek or Roman troops armed with the short spear and led by an able general. Nor did it ever find favor with distinguished tacticians of other nations. It was not adopted by Philopœmen, Hannibal, or Cæsar, nor imitated by the Swiss or Spanish infantry of modern times. For sixteen centuries after the overthrow of Macedon by Rome, the spear or javelin was the chief weapon, but its length was usually not more than nine feet, and never in any powerful army more than fourteen.

Several changes in the art of war were made by the Macedonians, as a consequence of the maintenance of large standing armies, which they were the first to establish in Greece. The grand phalanx was a much larger organization than any known to the Spartans or Athenians. It comprised 28,672 men, of whom more than half were hoplites, nearly one-third light infantry, and one-sixth cavalry. A simple phalanx had about one-fourth as many men as a grand phalanx.²

Alexander introduced the custom of taking his artillery—catapults and ballista—or all their parts except the heavy framework, along with his army on pack horses or wagons, so that he could soon have them ready, not only to attack walled towns, but also to use in his pitched battles. They were sometimes brought out in the openings between masses of cavalry or infantry to open a battle, as cannons are now.

As consequences of the Macedonian conquests, the Attic dialect was made the court language of Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia, and Egypt; Greek books were brought within the reach of educated men in all those countries; troops collected in each were stationed in the others, amidst a friendly population; natural prejudices gave way before increasing knowledge; and many things worthy of admiration were found among peoples previously hated or despised. Thus the nations about the eastern end of the Mediterranean were prepared for the unity and law which they afterwards found under the dominion of Rome.

In Macedon and Asia, Macedonian dynasties continued to flourish for about two centuries, but they made no valuable additions to polity, military science, or any important branch of culture. The dynasty of the Ptolemies

in Egypt distinguished itself by its intelligent patronage of science and literature and by the eminent ability of most of its monarchs, an ability which appeared to the most advantage in their services to the cause of knowledge. Their reigns furnish no material for this chapter on political and military history; and an account of them and of the valuable labor accomplished under their direction, will be reserved for the chapter on the literature of Greece.

SEC. 389. *The Achæan League*.—Although the highest legislative authority was not intrusted to a house of delegates in any Hellenic state, yet the Greeks were not without councils of a representative character. The Athenian senate comprised fifty senators chosen by each of the ten senatorial districts; but the body thus constituted had no legislative or administrative authority, it was merely a committee of the general assembly. Other democratic cities had presumably similar senates. The affairs of the Athenian league were managed by a house of deputies, but of the manner in which these deputies were elected we have no information. The same remarks may be made of the league under the headship of Sparta.

The most remarkable representative body of Greece was the Amphictyonic Council of Delphi, a body appointed to manage and protect the temple, and other property of Apollo, at Delphi. This council, consisting of delegates from twelve different branches of the Hellenic race, was founded ten or twelve centuries before the Christian era, and perhaps even earlier. Its constitution dated from a time so remote that, before the origin of Greek history, some of the states which participated in this council had fallen into insignificance, and others

had greatly increased in population and power. Thus the national representation in the council had come to be grossly disproportionate to the influence of the various states and branches of the Hellenic community.

Certain states had the privilege of appointing at least one delegate each, but it is possible that every citizen of any Greek state was entitled to participate in the meetings and votes of the council; the representatives of each branch of the Greek race deciding by a majority how the two votes of that branch should be cast. Usually the council attended to nothing save the business of the temple; and often when the religious sentiments and interests of the people demanded an expression of the Hellenic feeling, the Amphictyonic council, which could have spoken appropriately and effectively, was silent. On several occasions, however, it did give faithful and decided expression to Hellenic public opinion upon matters not directly within the scope of its local jurisdiction. Similar minor amphictyonies or federal ecclesiastical councils were maintained to protect other temples; and it is probable that all were organized on the same plan of representation.

Because they had no panhellenic political tribunal for the settlement of controversies between their cities, nor any system of combining their forces for prolonged action, the Greek states as a mass were wofully weak, while each separately was wonderfully strong in proportion to its population. When compelled to unite against the Persian invader, they gained great victories; to the smaller armies but more prudent policy and generalship of Macedon and Rome, they could offer no effective resistance.

Besides the ecclesiastical confederacies or amphictyo-

nies in Greece, several political leagues existed from prehistoric times down to the rise of Macedon, or even later. Among these the most notable were the Achæan, Ætolian, Arcadian and Boeotian leagues.

After the rise of Macedon, federation became much more prominent in Greece than ever before. The little states saw that they must unite their forces if they wished to maintain their free institutions. They must enter into leagues with republican neighbors or submit to the despotism of the northern monarchy. They preferred the former alternative, and in their movement for federation, Achæa became the leader. The old league in that nation was dissolved about 288 b. c. by the Macedonians, who established a despot in every walled town, and thus not only deprived Achæa of its previous federal unity, but placed its divided governments in the hands of men indebted to Macedon for their despotic power, and most of them dependent on it for support.

In 280 b. c., while that kingdom was in confusion because of the absence of King Pyrrhus, in Italy, and of the invasion of northern Greece by the Gauls, two of the Achæan towns expelled their despots, and agreed to form a league for mutual defense, probably readopting the old federal constitution. The leader in this movement was Marcos, an exile from the Achæan town of Ceryneia, which still remained subject to its despot. Marcos was so successful as the head of the new league that within a few months he gained two additional towns, and within six years all Achæa. Ceryneia was brought into the league by its despot Isæus, who, seeing the drift of public sentiment, declared himself in favor of the federation. Thus a new league arose, occupying all the territory of the old one. The first federal constitution of

Achaea had been framed in remote times, perhaps before the time of Solon. In the intervening three centuries the Greeks had made much progress in polity; and it seems highly probable that the instructive experience of Athens had its influence on the minds of Marcos and his companions. Circumstantial evidence implies that the new Achaea had a better constitution than the old one. The first league was quiet and obscure; the second one became active and prominent. The former frequently failed to give effective protection to its citizens; within three generations the latter had absorbed the whole Peloponnesus. Something of the greater success of the later league may be attributed to the decline of Athens, Sparta, and Thebes; but these states had been lamentably weak for half a century, while Achaea remained apparently as powerless as it had been while Sparta and Athens were at the summit of their power. The difference between the position which Achaea held in 320 b. c. and that which it held a century later, cannot be satisfactorily explained without the aid of the theory that its constitution had been modified in such a manner as to render its government more efficient. The new constitution was probably a written document, but here again we must trust to presumption. There is no copy of such a document, nor extract from it, nor explicit mention of its existence; but the political customs of the Greeks, and the nature of the league, justify the belief that it was founded on a written agreement.

The supreme power of the league was exercised by the federal assembly, which consisted of all male citizens thirty years of age or older, and met at Aegion, in Achaea, in two semi-annual sessions of three days

each. Though every citizen of full age was a member of this assembly, the vote was counted not by persons, but by cities, each of which had one vote, and the majority of the citizens present from a city decided how its vote should be cast. Thus, in an assembly comprising three thousand citizens, of whom two thousand were from Ægion, the federal capital, and one hundred from each of the other nine cities of Achaea, the decision of the assembly could be controlled by fifty-one attendants in each of six of the cities; for they sufficed to control the votes of a majority of the Achæan states. Most of the attendants in these federal assemblies were citizens of the federal capital. Relatively few came from other cities.

A ministry of ten members under the presidency of the federal general, had control of the administration. These officials and also a federal secretary and the judges of a federal court were elected annually by the assembly. Each city elected ten senators to the federal senate, which had the same relation to the federal assembly as the senate had to the assembly in Athens. There was no pay for ministers or senators; perhaps none for the general or the secretary.¹

Of the federal court we know little save that such a body existed, and that the league had the reputation of treating all its cities with equal justice. The custom of taking careful account of the conflicting claims of their different cities educated the federal officials to a temper of moderation and a habit of carefully studying all sides, which gave them a name for impartiality, and induced foreign states to appeal to them repeatedly to act as international arbitrators; and when they accepted, they performed their duties creditably. How far the federal judges participated in these arbitrations we do not know.²

There was no pay for the attendance or traveling expenses of the members of the assembly, and therefore those who came to its sessions in Aegion from other cities were mostly men of wealth and leisure. If they sympathized with the nobles, they were nevertheless strongly impelled to vote as members of the federal assembly in accordance with the dominant sentiment of their respective towns. If they defeated the wish of their fellow-citizens, they made themselves unpopular at home and exposed themselves to violence, to the use of which the Greeks, when irritated in their political quarrels, frequently resorted.

SEC. 390. *Aratos.*—In the early years of its existence, the new league was not disturbed by foreign enemies. Macedon had enough to occupy its attention elsewhere. Achaea was not powerful enough to require suppression, nor rich enough to reward spoliation.

It had maintained itself with internal harmony and increasing external credit, for twenty-three years, when it was astonished by an embassy from the Doric city of Sicyon, near the eastern border of Achaea, soliciting admission on equal terms. The applicant was much larger than any of the Achaean towns; with its dependent territory it had probably half as many people as the whole league; and in wealth and military power, it was superior to Achaea in proportion to population. It had been subject to Nicocles, a despot in alliance with Macedonia, when in 251 b. c., an exile named Aratos, only twenty years of age, sneaked into the city by night with some accomplices, seized the citadel, and when morning came, proclaimed and established a free government. Aratos, the head of the new administration, was a man of remarkable political capacity, and he had the advan-

tage of being recognized as an ally of Ptolemy of Egypt, who was an enemy of Macedon.

When Sicyon expelled its tyrant, five hundred exiles returned, and many of them, whose property had been confiscated because of their hostility to the despots, demanded the restoration of their estates. The rejection of their demand might lead to serious disorders, and so might compliance with it. The losers were an influential class, and so also were those who had bought the confiscated lands. Aratos examined the claims, and finding that he could pacify the despoiled with one hundred and seventy-five talents (\$175,000), obtained that sum from Ptolemy and settled the claims. Thus internal peace was secured, but the foreign relations were threatening. Macedon was near and hostile. Egypt was friendly but distant. Neither Athens nor Sparta was strong enough to give protection, nor would either give any aid unless placed in possession of the citadel. There was one refuge, the contiguous federation of Achaea, which might give efficient protection, and in no case would establish any odious domination. The Dorians generally considered it a disgrace to people of their blood to subordinate themselves to Achaeans, Ionians or Aeolians; but Aratos would not admit that membership in the Achaeian league meant subordination in any discreditable sense. He applied for admission into the league, and obtained it.

This enlargement of the Achaeian federation was the beginning of a new political era in Greece, that of international leagues, that of the absorption of the whole peninsula into one federal state, with officials from Spartan, Messenian, Arcadian, and Argolic cities sitting side by side in friendly co-operation as senators, ministers, and judges of a democratic republic.

In 293 the league acquired Corinth, Megara, Troizene, and Epidaurus; in 234 Megalopolis, and in 229 b. c. Argos, with which it possessed half the Peloponnesus. Megalopolis, the most important of these acquisitions, brought with it much of Arcadia, a large and well-disciplined army, and generals much superior to those furnished by any other part of the league. Of these the ablest were Lydiadas, who had been despot of Megalopolis, and surrendered his power for the purpose of transferring his city to the league, and Philopœmon, who became general of the league and extended its authority over the whole Peloponnesus.

The league had at first been quiet in its policy, but under Aratos it became aggressive in its schemes of annexation. It repeatedly undertook military enterprises in which it was disgracefully beaten. Aratos became distinguished for success in political plans and for failure in military movements. Unfortunately for the league, the able generals of Megalopolis never were allowed to have full command of the armies so long as Aratos lived, and by his military incapacity they were subjected to several humiliating defeats. The greatest of these disasters occurred in 224 b. c., when the confederated Achæans, under Aratos, confronted in battle the Spartans, under Cleomenes. The victories of Cleomenes were so complete that Aratos was compelled to choose between submission to the near Spartans and alliance with the more distant Macedonians. He preferred the latter alternative. He had to pay for the aid of his allies with the surrender of Corinth, a payment to which the Corinthians made the most strenuous objection, and which was doubtless highly disagreeable to Aratos and his fellow-citizens in the league generally, but it seemed better to

them that one city should be enslaved than a dozen; and if they had been compelled to accept a yoke for themselves, they would doubtless have accepted that of Macedon as the more generous, in preference to that of Sparta. No king of Macedon had enslaved Greeks and destroyed their cities with such relentless hate as had been shown by the aristocrats of the Eurotas. If Aratos had not obtained help from the north, Megalopolis would doubtless have been utterly destroyed.

With the help of Macedon, the Spartans were defeated at Sellasia, but they continued to show their hostility to the league at every opportunity until 207 b. c., when they were finally crushed at Mantinea by the army of the league under Philopœmen, who then had no Aratos to obstruct him. This was the most disastrous defeat that the Spartans ever suffered, and it made an end to all their insolent interference with the affairs of their neighbors.

Fifteen years later, Sparta, and soon afterwards Elis and Messenia, joined the league, which then included the whole Peloponnesus, and prevented any further discord there, and might have risen to great influence north of the Isthmus, if it had not been overshadowed, and after half a century absorbed, by the growing power of Rome.

The Achæan confederacy was not a strong government. It had serious defects in its military, financial, and legislative departments. Its general and its ministry were often afraid to take responsibility for fear they would be punished by the federal assembly if the result of their action should be disastrous. Their weakness came into plain view when, possessing half the Peloponnesus with a harmonious population, they could not defend themselves against Sparta with only one-sixth of

the Peloponnesus and a small governing class that had a very slight hold on the affection of its subjects.

In one respect the statesmen of Achaea were more fortunate than those of Athens; they were not compelled to account for their official conduct to an assembly or a court that under the excitement of the moment frequently became a furious mob. In the federal system there was no room for ostracism or for a jury sitting as a supreme court. Such prosecutions of eminent statesmen, generals, artists, and philosophers as disgraced Athens were unknown at Ægion. Marcos, Aratos, Lydiadas and Philopoemen were never officially accused of treasonable or corrupt practices, much less driven into exile, as were Aristides, Themistocles, Cimon and Thucydides, son of Melesias. No Achæan general was condemned to death by an Achæan court as were the six victorious generals of Arginusæ, by an Athenian court. Nor does any stain of gross dishonesty attach itself to the name of any statesman prominent in Achæan history; and the multitude of such stains in Athenian history is to be attributed not to the greater prevalence of dishonesty, but to the fact that in Athens the power was intrusted to a multitude, divided into two factions, one of which was always anxious to hear, to accredit, and to reward any plausible accusation against an influential statesman of the opposite side.

The Achæan league attracted or produced a number of men who served the state with ability and zeal. Of these, the first was Marcos, who led in the organization of the new federation, and continued to be a prominent citizen, frequently serving in high office, for half a century. Isæus and Lydiadas, who surrendered their despotic power in Boura and Megalopolis, and led their cities into

the league, proved to be faithful friends of freedom. Aratos, who was rewarded with the generalship immediately after bringing Sicyon into the league, and continued to control the federal administration for thirty years, was a man of pure motives, but his distrust of the Megalopolitan generals led to many serious disasters. Of all the Achæan statesmen, the ablest and the most successful was Philopœmen, who had the satisfaction of bringing Sparta, Messena, and Elis into the league. His combination of high political and military talents with rare purity of motive, entitles him to be placed near Aristides, Pericles, Epaminondas, and Timoleon, if not on an equality with them. As a general he has been considered worthy to be classed with his eminent contemporaries, Hannibal and Scipio Africanus,¹ whose greater fame was perhaps due only to the wider spheres in which they displayed their talents.

This second Achæan league, founded in 280 b. c., maintained its existence for one hundred and thirty-four years, with a dominion including the entire Peloponnesus for half a century, and finally gave way to the Roman power in 146 b. c. During the last half century of its existence it included the whole Peloponnesus, as well as Corinth and Megara. Its influence was also felt north of the Corinthian gulf, where nearly all the Greeks combined their strength in federal unions.² In 189 b. c. there were ten leagues in Greecee. Those of Achæa, Bœotia and Aetolia were of ancient origin, but recently reorganized; those of Acarnania, Phocis, Eubœa, Thessaly, Epirus, Magnesia, and Perrhaebia, were of late date. The Achæan federal constitution is the only one of which we can obtain a distinct idea; the others were probably similar in the more important points.

SEC. 391. *Bœotia, etc.*—Important as was the part played by Bœotia in Grecian history, our knowledge of its government is very incomplete. Except during several brief periods, its political system was aristocratic and federal. Its league comprised nine or eleven cities, each of which had one representative, or Bœotarch, in the ministry, except Thebes, the chief city, which had two. It is uncertain whether the board of Bœotarchs numbered eleven or thirteen; possibly it had the smaller number at one period and the larger at another. The ministry seems to have exercised or controlled all the political authority of the league. We read nothing of a federal assembly, such as that of Achæa. The Bœotarchs were elected for annual terms by the various cities, to which respectively they were responsible for the manner in which they performed their duties.

The chief city and its dependent territory had perhaps one-third of the inhabitants of Bœotia, and seemed to be at a great disadvantage in the ministry, where it had only one-sixth of the votes; but by its central position, strong military power, and metropolitan relations, it controlled the government and subjected the larger of its confederate cities—Orchomenos, Thespia, and Platæa—to an oppressive domination, which they always wished to throw off, and against which they frequently revolted. Most of the Boeotian towns were too small, and too near to Thebes, to think of maintaining their independence without her help, and therefore were always ready to accept her dictation; and some of the Bœotarchs might be influenced in their action by the fact that their board held its sessions in Thebes, whose public opinion was a continual pressure upon them, and in times of great excitement might be a source of serious

personal danger to them. Neither in the earlier nor in the later leagues of the Greeks was there ever any apportionment of delegates on the basis of population, or military force; and the knowledge of the inequality of the representation in the federal council, and the unfairly large share of influence given to Thebes, was doubtless one of the chief causes of the ordinary military weakness of Bœotia. "The whole internal history of Bœotia is one long record of feuds between Thebes and the other cities, Platæa, Thespia, and Orchomenos. And the lesson is the more striking because, as far as we can make out from our scanty notices of the Bœotian constitution, the mere formal position of Thebes does not seem to have been at all extravagant or anomalous. To the great executive college of the Bœotarchs, while the other cities contributed one member each, Thebes contributed two. That is, in the chief magistracy of the federation, the great city of Thebes legally commanded only two votes out of eleven or thirteen. Yet we find the Bœotian League, throughout two-thirds of its history, existing only as an instrument to advance Theban interests, constantly to the disadvantage, sometimes to the utter destruction, of the smaller towns of the confederation."¹

The Arcadian and Aetolian leagues were combinations of districts rather than of cities; and the Arcadian federation in early times was a bond so weak, that the different cities and districts frequently made peace and war without consulting, and apparently without seriously offending, the other members of their league. Aetolia had a stronger union; next to Achaea it had a higher federal authority than any other part of Greece; it acted with more consistency and efficiency in its foreign rela-

tions, and in proportion to population it had a better army than that of Achaea. Plutarch and Polybius hated the Ætolians, and called them “robbers;” but supply no proof to sustain their accusation, and furnish much evidence to discredit it. The Ætolians were a rude nation, and some of their dealings with other states were harsh; but not more harsh than those of Thebes or Sparta. They had a federal general, secretary, ministry, and senate; once a year they held a federal assembly, in which every Ætolian citizen was a member with a vote, but his vote was counted only in the section of his district or city; and the decision of the assembly was controlled by the majority of cities.

In 189 b. c. nearly all Greece was in leagues. The Peloponnesus, with Megara and Corinth, formed the Achæan league; Ætolia, Acarnania, Phocis, Bœotia, Eubœa, Thessaly, Epirus, Magnesia, and Perrhaebia, had each its federal government. South of the thirty-ninth parallel of latitude, Attica and Locris, among the Greek states, on the mainland, did not belong to a league. Threatened by Rome on one side, and by Macedonia on the other, the Greek cities saw that they could not stand separately; but they delayed their combination until they could no longer resist the advance of alien domination.

Under Rome the Greeks shared the fate of the other subjects; they were cruelly plundered. With no protection against spoliation and little against personal outrage by their insolent foreign masters, they had scant encouragement for toil, economy, or study. Manufactures and commerce languished; wealth and population diminished; literature and art sank into insignificance; and the superiority of the schools in Athens was caused, not by their high merits, but by the deficiencies of all rivals.

CHAPTER XXIV.

GREEK RELIGION.

SECTION 392. *Poetic Myths*.—The religion of the Greeks was an idolatrous polytheism. It recognized about a dozen great gods, a vast multitude of minor divinities, and the ancestral spirits, which last were worshiped at the domestic hearth of every citizen. Among the great gods were Zeus, the ruler of the skies; Phœbus (Apollo), the god of light, music and poetry, and the chief agent for communicating by oracles, to men, the decrees of Zeus; Poseidon (Neptune), the master of the seas; Ares (Mars), the god of war; Aphrodite (Venus), the goddess of love; Athena (Minerva), the goddess of science, philosophy and art; Hephaestus (Vulcan), the god of fire; Hera (Juno), sister and wife of Zeus and goddess of marriage; Demeter (Ceres), goddess of agriculture, and Dionysus (Bacchus), the god of wine. Among the minor divinities were the gods of many professions and localities. Every city had its divine patron, worshiped in a special temple. The Greek gods were not jealous. They allowed their worshipers to adore other gods. No Greek city limited its adorations to a single deity, or prohibited the worship of any god in the Hellenic pantheon. In public opinion, a sacrifice to one god did not mean the desertion of another. An offering was due to Poseidon from a man when going to sea, to Ares when starting on a military campaign, to

Demeter, when sowing a grain field, and to Athena when planting olive trees. The same person not only might with propriety, but often must, pay his adoration to several different divinities in the same day. Those actions which took him into the jurisdictions of various gods, should, if important, be accompanied by his devotions.

Many religious ideas current in Greece were derived from older contemporaneous nations. The Greek Zeus is near akin in etymology and signification to the Hindoo Dyaus; the Greek Uranus to the Hindoo Varuna; and the Greek Eos (dawn) to the Hindoo Ushas. The Greek and Hindoo myths show numerous close relationships. The Hindoo tenet of transmigration was accepted by Plato and many of his contemporaries. Herodotus found in Egypt the origin of many ecclesiastical usages common in his own nationality. The Greek Elysium suggests the Egyptian Aalu, the home of the blest. There are many resemblances between the ecclesiastical systems of Greece and Phœnicia. Melicertes, a title of Hercules in Corinth, is evidently the Syrian Melkarth in Hellenic spelling. Adonis and Apollo are the Greek forms of the Asiatic Adonai and Aplu. The arrangement and management of some of the temples of Aphrodite were imitations of those of Astarte. Though rare, not favored by predominant public sentiment, and not tolerated in any Hellenic city as a regular form of appeasing the gods, human sacrifice was not unknown to the historical Greeks.¹ Its occasional appearance among them was due less to the preservation of a custom of their Aryan ancestors than to the imitation of the rites of their contemporaries in Phœnicia.

All the Greeks had the same religion, the same gods,

the same conception of the divine nature, and the same modes of worship. All their cities had temples built on the same plan, idols, sacrifices, oracles, and omens. None had a written revelation, a precise creed necessary to salvation, or a priesthood that controlled the future fate of mankind. The belief in the immortality of the soul was universal, but the conception of the life to come was vague. In the literature of the ancient Greeks there is no distinct statement of the doctrine of rewards and punishments hereafter, for virtue and vice here.

The Hellenic ecclesiastical system had neither a famous founder like Zoroaster or Buddha, nor a sacred book. Its nearest approach to a great prophet was Homer; its nearest approximation to a gospel was the Iliad. In that great epic poem, all the greater gods and all the classes of divinities are introduced, incidentally and in disconnected passages, from which, however, may be deduced a comprehensive and harmonious system of divine attributes and characteristics, and of celestial government. This book, made familiar to everybody by frequent public recitations, full of charm and impressiveness for the weakest and the strongest minds, though secular in its general purpose and tone, was a high ecclesiastical authority. It was in all likelihood, as Gladstone says, "a main instrument in establishing the dominant features of the Hellenic religion."²

Divinity and humanity as conceived by the Greeks, were not far apart. Many distinguished families were descended from celestial ancestors. The leading chieftains who took part in the Trojan war were the sons, grandsons, and great-grandsons of various gods. Divine blood flowed in the veins of the nobles of Athens, Sparta, Argos, Corinth, and other Greek states, and

was traced in genealogies that were not questioned by the multitude.

Even those citizens whose ancestors had been exclusively human in all their generations, acquired a divine dignity by death. They became so powerful that they were entitled to worship from their descendants. In the world of spirits, they retained their interest in mundane affairs, and they had power to give material aid to their devout descendants, over whom they constantly watched, and to whom they, as well as the great and minor gods, often gave signals of events that were to come.

The average Greek was greedy for stories of the participation of the gods in human life. As Grote says: "He looked for wonders and unusual combinations in the past; he expected to hear of gods, heroes, and men moving and operating together upon earth; he pictured to himself the fore-time as a theater in which the gods interfered directly, obviously and frequently, for the protection of their favorites and the punishment of their foes. The rational conception, then only dawning in his mind, of a systematic course of nature, was absorbed by this fervent and lively faith. And if he could have been supplied with as perfect and philosophical a history of his own real past time, as we are now enabled to furnish with regard to the last century of England or France, faithfully recording all the successive events, and accounting for them by known positive laws, but introducing no special interventions of Zeus or Apollo—such a history would have appeared to him not merely unholy and unimpressive, but destitute of all plausibility or title to credence."³

In the VIth century b. c. the Greeks generally believed that the gods had abandoned the custom observed by

them in earlier times, of coming down frequently to earth, making themselves visible and audible to men, associating familiarly with them, giving them lessons in poetry, music, polity, and war, planting vines, olive trees, and grain fields, building ships, temples, and cities, and making love with success to women and men. Nearly every city had its legends, accepted with complete credence, about the visits which it received from its patron god in perceptible human form, the blessings he had conferred, and the friendly treatment with which he had honored the citizens of a prior generation.

The cessation of such divine visits was admitted and lamented. It was attributed to the increasing demoralization of mankind, to the augmenting vulgarization of human life, to the growing force of a skepticism that was insulting to the gods, and to the advancing blindness that incapacitated men for seeing the divine influences surrounding them on every side. And this explanation was accepted by many who would have sneered at a story that the child of any unmarried woman of their acquaintance had been begotten by Zeus or Phœbus. They believed implicitly that Hercules, Achilles, Æneas, and numerous other legendary heroes, had actually existed and were of divine parentage; but they did not imagine that the gods begat sons in their time.

The poetic myth as a feature of religious belief reached its highest development in Greece. Beautiful legends were associated with many of the most striking natural phenomena, and men seemed to be lifted up to heaven while the gods were brought down to earth.

"All things were alive, most things were conscious beings; and all the phenomena of the universe were but the actions of these personal agents. If, in the clear

heaven, the big drops fell from the suddenly gathered clouds, these were the tears which Zeus wept for the death of his son Sarpedon. If, in the autumn-time, the leaves fell from the trees and the earth put on a mourning garb, this was because Persephone, the summer child, had been stolen from the great mother, and because her sorrow could not be lightened until the maiden should be brought back at the joyous trysting-place of Eleusis. If the sun, which plunged into the sea in the evening, came back after a few hours to cheer the earth with his radiance, this was because during the night he had journeyed round the ocean stream in his golden car and had been gladdened with the sight of his wife and children. For the Greek, ‘the moon wandering among the stars of lesser birth,’ was Asterodia surrounded by the fifty daughters of Endymion, the attendant virgins of Ursula in the christianized myth. All the movements of the planets were, for him, fully explained by this unquestioned fact; and with the same unhesitating assurance he would account for all sights or sounds on the earth or in the heavens. The snow-storm was Niobe weeping for her murdered children; the earthquake was the heaving caused by the struggles of imprisoned giants who were paying the penalty for rebellion against the lord of heaven. . . . The stars and the clouds were the exulting dancers who clashed their cymbals round the cradle of Zeus; the sun was the hero compelled to go his weary round for the children of men, or crucified daily on his blazing wheel, or condemned to heave to the summit of the heaven the stone which thence rolled down to the abyss.”⁴

As compared with Christianity, the religion of the Greeks was simple. It had no puzzles or impossibilities

of creed, called mysteries. It had no incarnation; no double nature, both human and divine in its divinity; no satisfaction of celestial justice for the sin of one man by the punishment of another; no god that consisted of three persons; no conversion of bread into flesh and blood by the word of a priest; and no gospel, the text of which provoked criticism. The numerous Christian subtleties, among which these are some of the most notable, have no parallels in the faith of ancient Greece.⁵

SEC. 393. *Greek Worship*.—The sacerdotal profession was not numerous or powerful. It had no hierarchical organization, no chief priest, for all Greece, nor for any state, nor for all the temples of any one god in different cities. In its discipline and revenue every shrine was independent of all others. Many sacerdotal positions were open to commoners, but in each of the great temples, the priests belonged to one ancient noble family, which had a hereditary right of ministering there.

Without a hierarchical system that might offer successive promotions to ambitious priests, without any considerable sacerdotal influence in state affairs, and without a precise written creed that might serve as a standard of orthodoxy, the relations between the political and ecclesiastical departments of life in ancient Greece were very quiet. Men were sometimes punished for impiety; but in these cases the priests did not appear as complainants. There never was a general persecution of heretics or unbelievers.

The authority of priest was originally attached to that of king; and, as a general rule, when the monarchy was overthrown, the royal family retained the priesthood in the temple of the patron god of the city. In Sparta, where the royal title was preserved, though it was con-

fected on two men at the same time, and though the office was deprived of its political authority, the nominal kings were really priest-generals. They consulted the omens and declared what the state could do with the approval of the gods.

The temples of the Greeks were the most splendid of their buildings. Those of Athena and Zeus in Athens, of Demeter at Eleusis, of Apollo in Delphi and Delos, of Zeus in Olympia, and of Diana in Ephesus were among the most noted works of Hellenic architecture. The temple had a shelter for the statue of the god, and for certain offerings; and in large temples, this shelter was in a front hall, behind which was a rear chamber for articles used in worship, and for temple treasures. Outside of the main building but near its front entrance, was an altar for sacrifice. Many temples had extensive grounds; and in these were buildings for the slaughter of beasts to be sacrificed, and for the dwellings of the priests and their servants. In a few cases in Greece proper, the temples of Aphrodite owned and kept on the temple grounds a large number of public women, most, if not all of whom, were slaves. A celebrated institution of this kind was at Corinth.

On account of their sacredness, some of the leading temples were places of deposit for money and other valuables; and because of the number of their visitors from distant places, they were centers of information. In both these respects, as a bank, and as a focus of news, the temple at Delphi was far in advance of any other. Its priests were in the habit of carefully questioning the applicants for oracles, and thus they accumulated a large stock of knowledge, which assisted them in giving responses that would fit any result.

Certain temples, such as those of Æsculapius, had in their grounds, or in their vicinity, buildings for the shelter of invalids, who were there attended by priests skilled in medicine and surgery. In some cases the patient fasted and then slept in the temple, with a hope that he would be told by the god in a dream what remedy he should use.

The worshiper prepared himself for addressing the god by dipping his fingers into the bowl of consecrated water, which stood in the main chamber of every temple. To prevent any mistake in the title which he gave to the divinity, he prayed for favor "whether this or another be your favorite name" and "whether you be god or goddess."¹ When the customs of the temple required a sacrifice of a certain beast from the worshiper, if he was too poor to purchase the animal, he might offer instead, a figure of the beast in bread or cake. The trickery common among the spirit mediums of modern times was not unknown to the ancient Greeks. "There were temples called Plutonia, where the spirits of the dead were conjured up to answer questions."² The gods and perhaps also goddesses were materialized for those who were not satisfied with associations of flesh and blood. Aristotle says "even to our times, in that place [the Bukeion], the wife of the Archon king is intrusted once every year to matrimonial communication with Bacchus."³

The temple was not a place for public worship. It had no room for a congregation. Its chief purposes were to provide a home for the god; to conciliate him by its construction and maintenance; to furnish a place where private worship could be paid to him; and to sustain a priesthood which should supervise his private worship and manage his public festivals. The acts of

private worship in the temple were prayers, sacrifices of beasts, offerings of fruits, wine, and flowers, and the fulfillment of vows made when divine help was needed. The private adoration of the domestic divinities, the most important and most frequent exercise of Greek devotion, was paid in the house at every meal by an offering of a particle of food, a pinch of salt, and a libation of a few drops of wine thrown on the hearth or poured on the floor. The public worship of Greece included festivals and occasional sacrifices by order of the state. The panathenaic festival and dramatic performances of Athens, and the international athletic games at Olympia, Delphi, Nemea, and the Isthmus of Corinth were all given in honor of the gods and were regarded as acts of worship to them.

In the worship of the temples, and of certain noble families, great importance was attached to ancient liturgies, which, it was supposed, had secured the favor of the gods, and must be repeated with the greatest exactness, and preserved with the greatest secrecy. The relation of the worshiper to the god was supposed to be confidential; any betrayal of the language, or any admission of a stranger to the ceremonies, was sacrilegious. Strict rules governed the dress, the attitudes, and the tones of the priests while they were engaged in worship.⁴

The temple of Demeter at Eleusis occupied an exceptional position in the Greek religion. She was the goddess of agriculture, but it was in her character of the afflicted mother, mourning for her daughter, that her worship was peculiar, significant, and influential. She promised comfort to the sad; she invited them to her mysteries; she provided a secret formula of initiation which should secure peace of mind for them in this

world and happiness in the next. Her temple had a large hall where pilgrims assembled at her great annual festivals, which sometimes attracted as many as 30,000 from other states to Attica. These pilgrims and the Athenians who intended to accompany them spent two days in the city, going through the rites of purification, and then marched in procession twelve miles to Eleusis, where they went through ceremonies which have not been described, but which were supposed to prepare men for holiness in life and for happiness after death.

SEC. 394. *Greek Monotheism*.—In the later centuries of Greece, many of the philosophers were monotheists. To them the error of the popular polytheism was quite apparent. They accepted only one divine existence, but they did not attempt to disturb the faith of the multitude. They supposed that the traditional mythology, notwithstanding some objectionable features, helped the state to maintain order. They considered it a valuable aid to the police. They feared that a rabble without superstition would be ungovernable. Under the ancient faith, states had been founded, and without it perhaps they could not be preserved. Such were the ideas of Plato, and of many of his philosophic successors, and perhaps also of some of his predecessors; and it was under the influence of these ideas that ancient Greece produced no reformer of the popular religion.

“The philosophers,” says Felton, “universally rejected the popular notions of the gods, and almost universally the belief in a multiplicity of gods; though, as a matter of expediency and prudence, they generally fell in with the observances of the popular worship, so far, at least, as the laws of the state required religious conform-

ity. But after all there was a wide separation between them and the body of the people, who, partly from the fanaticism natural to ignorance, and partly from the apprehension of losing the enjoyments placed within their reach by the religious festivals, persecuted with unrelenting hostility any man who was suspected of questioning the national faith. They could laugh over the vices and absurdities attributed by the poets to the gods and goddesses, the cowardice and lewdness of Dionysus, the intrigues of Aphrodite, the sneaking amours of Zeus, the scolding jealousy of Hera; but if an earnest seeker after the truth came to doubt the existence of these precious models of divine nature, and pronounced that the universe was created and governed by one God, holy, omnipresent, eternal, and indivisible, he could look only for banishment or death from the popular tribunals."¹

The earlier Hellenic poetry contains many henotheistic passages. The following is from the Orphic remains:—

“ One self-existent lives; created things
Arise from him, and he is all in all.
No mortal sight may see him, yet himself
Sees all that live. He out of good can bring
Evil to men, dread battle, tearful woes;
He, and no other. Open to thy sight
Were all the chain of things, could’s thou behold
The Godhead, ere as yet he stepped on earth.

* * * * *

Jove is the first and last, who the infant thunder hurled;
Jove is the head and midst; the framer of the world;
Jove is a male; a nymph of bloom immortal, Jove:
Jove is the base of earth, and starry heaven above;
Jove is the breath of all; the force of quenchless flame;
The root of ocean, Jove; the sun and moon the same.

Jove is the king, the sire, whence generation sprang ;
One strength, one Demon great, on whom all beings
hang ;
His regal body grasps the vast material round ;
There fire, earth, air and wave, and day and night are
found ;
Wisdom, first maker, there, and joy-prolific Love ;
All these concentering fill the mighty frame of Jove.”²

Æschylus says :—

“ Zeus is the earth and air, and Zeus the heavens ;
Yea, Zeus is all and what is over all.”

The Stoics as a class were monotheists, and their conception of the divine nature was not less enlightened than that of modern Christian scholars, who have found much to admire in the theology and piety of such writers as Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius, who, though Romans, gave expression to teachings that had their origin in Greece. Among the Hellenic Stoics was Cleanthes, whose hymn to Jupiter, conceived not as a national divinity but as the universal god who looks with equal favor on all mankind, is here given in translation :—

“ Most glorious of the immortal Powers above !
Oh, thou of many names ! mysterious Jove !
Forevermore Almighty ! Nature’s source !
That govern’st all things in their ordered course !
All hail to thee ! since innocent of blame,
E’en mortal creatures may address thy name ;
For all that breathe and creep the lowly earth,
Echo thy being with reflected birth ;
Thee will I sing, thy strength for aye resound ;
The universe, that rolls this globe around,
Moves wheresoe’er thy plastic influence guides,
And, ductile, owns the God whose arm presides.

The lightnings are thy ministers of ire;
The double-forked, and ever living fire;
In thy unconquerable hands they glow,
And at the flash all nature quakes below.
Thus, thunder-armed, thou dost creation draw,
To one immense, inevitable law;
And with the various mass of breathing souls
Thy power is mingled, and thy spirit rolls.
Dread genius of creation! all things bow
To thee; the universal monarch thou!
Nor aught is done without thy wise control,
On earth or sea, or round the ethereal pole,
Save when the wicked, in their frenzy blind,
Act o'er the follies of a senseless mind.
Thou curbest the excess. Confusion to thy sight
Moves regular; the unlovely scene is bright.
Thy hand, educating good from evil, brings
To one apt harmony the strife of things.
One ever-during law still binds the whole,
Though shunned, resisted, by the sinner's soul.
Wretches! while still they course the glittering prize,
The law of God eludes their ears and eyes.
Life then were virtue, did they this obey;
But wide from life's chief good they headlong stray.
Now glory's arduous toils the breast inflame;
Now avarice thirsts, insensible of shame;
Now sloth unnerves them in voluptuous ease;
And the sweet pleasures of the body please.
With eager haste they rush the gulf within,
And their whole souls are centered in their sin.
But oh, great Jove! by whom all good is given!
Dweller with lightnings, and the clouds of heaven!
Save from their dreadful error lost mankind!

Father! disperse these shadows of the mind!
Give them thy pure and righteous law to know;
Wherewith thy justice governs all below.
Thus honored by the knowledge of thy way,
Shall men that honor to thyself repay;
And bid thy mighty works in praises ring,
As well befits a mortal's lips to sing.
More blest, nor men nor heavenly powers can be,
Than when their songs are of thy law and thee!"³

SEC. 395. *Delphi*.—The Greek religion included the belief that the gods gave to men omens or signs indicating the results of every important action that he proposed to himself, and that they had taught men how to interpret these omens correctly. The celestial signs for man's guidance were given in many ways; by meteorological phenomena; by the movements and cries or songs of quadrupeds, birds, and insects; by the appearance of the entrails of animals sacrificed; and by his own involuntary movements, such as sneezing or stumbling.

The future was also made known to man by priests or priestesses, who were directly inspired by some god, without the aid of any visible sign. It was considered dangerous and impious to begin any important enterprise without the approval of an omen or oracle. If the advice given by the diviner or priest seemed injudicious, it was presumed, not that the agent of the god was wrong, but that the applicant for celestial advice had committed some blunder, or had misinterpreted the instructions given, and he might make another inquiry.

The most remarkable case in Greek history of national disaster caused by divination occurred to the Athenian expedition in Sicily. When Nicias, the commander, found that he could not take Syracuse, nor

achieve any conquest in Sicily, he prepared to retreat, but was stopped by an eclipse of the moon. His soothsayer said he must stop twenty-seven days before moving. He obeyed, and the result was that his army was captured and enslaved, and Athens greatly weakened and impoverished. Afterwards the Athenians said the soothsayer did not understand his business; the eclipse was a sign to facilitate and hasten retreat.

The delivery of oracles, that is the direct response of a god to questions addressed to him, without reference to any visible omen, was considered the special business of Apollo, who had a temple in every large Grecian city, where the priests gave prophecies to inquirers. Only two of these temples had Panhellenic credit, those of Delphi, and of Delos.

As a source of oracular responses, the most famous, the one that commanded the greatest faith over a wide area, and among the most intelligent people of antiquity, was the Temple of Apollo, at Delphi, north of the Corinthian gulf, and near its shore. This shrine gained its credit in prehistoric times before the composition of the Homeric poems, and retained it until after Christianity had become the state religion of the Roman empire.

The temple of Delphi was situated in a ravine, and was built over a spring, from which arose an exhilarating or intoxicating gas. In these fumes, the woman, or pythoness, who was the agent of the divinity for declaring the divine revelations of future events, placed herself, and then responded to inquiries addressed to her by the patron, who had previously offered a sacrifice in the temple grounds, and had otherwise complied with the rules of the place. It is said that a woman was chosen to officiate, probably on account of her nervous temperament;

and the smoke, gas, and her own imagination quickly intoxicated her. At first the woman selected was young, but a love affair having occurred, it was decided that no one under fifty should be eligible.

The responses of the pythoness were usually incoherent, and were taken down by attendant priests, who revised them, and gave them a poetical form before delivering them to the inquirers. In many cases the responses, thus revised, were highly enigmatical, and were not less puzzling than the practical problems for which solutions were wanted. Not unfrequently statesmen obtained predictions for their guidance, and then could not agree upon the interpretation. The event decided what the oracle meant.

Complaint was repeatedly made that the Delphic oracle had been bribed or otherwise improperly influenced, but in the most notable of these cases, such as the contests between Hippias and the Athenian democracy, and between Philip and Demosthenes, the results justified the Delphic commands and predictions.

The Delphic oracle occupies a place so prominent in the history of Greece, and it commanded the full faith of so many intelligent men, that it deserves our attention. It aids us to understand how plausible the priests of false religions can be; how easy it is for men to masquerade as gods and thus deceive their fellows; how well they play their part; how readily and boldly they assume the tone of celestial command.

Herodotus, to whom we are indebted for most of our stories about the temple of Delphi, tells us that Croesus, King of Lydia, sent messengers to several oracles, to make inquiry at a certain hour on a certain day, what he, Croesus, was doing at that time, and to bring the re-

sponse as written down by the clerk of the oracle. When the day and hour arrived, he was boiling pieces of a lamb and of a tortoise together in a brass pot. The response of the Delphic oracle was the only correct one.

Crœsus then sent very liberal presents to this oracle, in which he had great faith, and made an inquiry whether he should attack Cyrus. The reply was that, if he did, he would destroy a mighty empire. To a third inquiry, whether his own kingdom would be of long duration, the response was that it would last till a mule should reign over the Medes. Supposing that a mule never would occupy the Median throne, he attacked Cyrus, and was defeated, and taken captive. To his complaint that he had been deceived, the oracle replied that he had overthrown a mighty empire, and he had been defeated when a mule reigned over the Medes, for Cyrus was a half-breed, the son of a Persian father and a Median mother. Crœsus admitted that he had misinterpreted the responses.

A young man of Thera, who stuttered, went to Delphi to get advice about the impediment in his speech. The response to his question called him "Battus," and ordered him to build a city in that part of Africa south of Greece. He protested that he had no money or power sufficient to establish a colony far from any other Greeks, but he got no other reply. He returned to his city, and remained there till various disasters overtook it, and when inquiry was made at Delphi, the Theraeans were told to send a colony to Africa under Battus. They dispatched their colonists, who settled on an island near Africa, and, after suffering many hardships, these colonists sent a delegation to Delphi with their complaint, and with solicitation for further instructions. Their assertion

that they had obeyed the previous order of Apollo was contradicted by the oracle; they were told that they were not in Africa; they must make their home on the mainland. They did so, and founded the wealthy city of Cyrene. The word Battus in the native language of that region meant king, and the man whom the oracle called Battus became the sovereign of the new Greek state.¹

Before the birth of Cypselus, who became despot of Corinth, two prophecies of his greatness were made by the Delphic oracle. Of these one predicted that he and his son, but not his grandson, should rule over his native city. His son was Periander, after whose death, in 585 B. C., an aristocratic government was established.

Miltiades owed his eminence to the oracle of Delphi. He was a noble Athenian, but was dissatisfied with the political affairs of Attica, where he had no influence in the government. One day he was at his front door, when he saw a party of men foreign in dress, looks, and manners, evidently aliens. He invited them into his house, and they followed him into his court yard, where they immediately saluted him as their master and prince, and begged him to come and rule over the land of the Dolonician Thracians, of whom they were the ambassadors. Their people, at war with a powerful neighboring state, had inquired at Delphi how they could conquer; and the response was that they should send an embassy to Athens, by the sacred road, and should accept as their sovereign the first Athenian who should offer hospitality to them. Regarding their request as a divine command to him, Miltiades accepted. He gave his subjects victory and prosperity, and they gave him wealth, fame, and experience with the Persians. These enabled him to conquer at Marathon.

When the Dorians invaded Attica in mythical times, they were told that they would succeed if they spared the life of the Athenian king. Codrus, the monarch, having been informed of the response, and being determined to offer himself as a sacrifice for his country, went in disguise among the invaders, and having attacked them, was slain. When the Athenians claimed his body and revealed his rank, the Dorians considered their enterprise hopeless, and withdrew.

When Philip of Macedon was preparing to invade Persia, and inquired at Delphi whether he would succeed, the response was, “Crowned is the victim, the altar is ready; the stroke is impending.” Within a few days he was murdered. A stroke that he did not anticipate was impending.

SEC. 396. *Various Responses.*—After Thermopylæ, the Athenian government sent a deputation to consult the oracle. “Hardly had the envoys completed the customary rites about the sacred precinct, and taken their seats inside the sanctuary of the god, when the Pythoness, Aristonicé by name, thus prophesied:—

“Wretches, why sit ye here? Fly, fly to the ends of creation,

Quitting your homes, and the crags which your city crowns with her circlet.

Neither the head, nor the body, is firm in its place, nor at bottom

Firm the feet, nor the hands, nor resteth the middle uninjured.

All—all ruined and lost; since fire, and impetuous Ares, Speeding along in a Syrian chariot, haste to destroy her. Not alone shalt thou suffer; full many the towers he will level,

Many the shrines of the gods he will give to a fiery destruction.

Even now they stand with dark sweat horribly dripping,
Trembling and quaking for fear, and lo! from the high roofs trickleth

Black blood, sign prophetic of hard distresses impending.
Get ye away from the temple, and brood on the ills that await ye."

When the Athenian messengers heard this reply, they were filled with the deepest affliction; whereupon Timon, the son of Androbulus, one of the men of most mark among the Delphians, seeing how utterly cast down they were at the gloomy prophecy, advised them to take an olive branch, and, entering the sanctuary again, consult the oracle as suppliants. The Athenians followed this advice, and, going in once more, said: "O King, we pray thee, reverence these boughs of supplication which we bear in our hands, and deliver to us something more comforting concerning our country. Else we will not leave thy sanctuary, but will stay here till we die." Upon this the priestess gave them a second answer, which was the following:—

"Pallas has not been able to soften the Lord of Olympus, Though she has often prayed him, and urged him with excellent counsel.

Yet once more I address thee in words than adamant firmer.

When the foe shall have taken whatever the limit of Cecrops

Holds within it and all which divine Cithæron shelters, Then far-seeing Jove grants this to the prayers of Athena; Safe shall the wooden wall continue for thee and thy children.

Wait not the tramp of the horse, nor the footmen
mighty moving
Over the land, but turn your back to the foe, and retire
ye.

Yet shall a day arrive when ye shalt meet him in battle.
Holy Salamis, thou shalt destroy the offspring of women,
When men scatter the seed, or when they gather the
harvest."¹

With these responses, the deputies hastened back to Athens, where there was an anxious consultation about their meaning. One interpretation which found prominent advocates was that Attica must be finally abandoned by its people, who should first cross over to Salamis, and thence sail away to some distant land, where they should found a new city. The safety of the wooden wall indicated transportation from their ancestral land in their ships. Another view accepted by few was that the defenders of Athens would be secure behind a wooden wall on the acropolis. Themistocles, however, argued that the wooden wall was the fleet of Athens, which was to gain a victory near Salamis. If that place were to be only a spot of brief sojourn, it would have been called "unlucky" instead of "holy Salamis." The island would be doubly sacred if his opinion were correct, first, as a refuge for the Athenians during a brief period while the Persians occupied their city, and second, as a witness of a victory at sea not less glorious than that of Marathon on land. This argument was convincing to the minds and congenial to the patriotic devotion of the Athenians. They staked their fortunes and their lives upon it and achieved the triumph which they deserved.

Before the battle of Platæa the Athenians sought advice at Delphi, and were told that they would triumph,

if they fought in their own land on the plain of the Eleusinian goddess. This seemed to predict defeat if the battle should occur in Bœotia; but the Platæans interpreted it otherwise. They found that there was a little Eleusinian temple in the valley near their town, and they dug up the boundary stones so that their territory should not be distinguishable from that of Attica.

Lycurgus and Solon each had the most encouraging response from Delphi, and each laid the foundation of an original and successful national constitution. The oracle promised that Sparta should flourish so long as she should adhere to the institutions of Lycurgus, and events justified the promise.

While the Spartans were striving to subdue Messena, with little prospect of success, they inquired what they should do to conquer. The reply was that they must get an Athenian for an adviser. Thereupon they sent an embassy to Athens with a solicitation that the Athenian government should send them a leader. A lame schoolmaster was selected as a man who would render the least service, for the Athenians did not wish to see the Messenians enslaved; but the martial poems of this schoolmaster, Tyrtæus, aroused such enthusiasm among the Spartans that they carried everything before them.

When Xerxes, with his army, approached Greece, the Spartans sent to Delphi to inquire whether they should fight. The following response was received:—

“Oh! ye men who dwell in the streets of broad Lace-dæmon,
Either your glorious town shall be sacked by the children of Perseus,
Or, in exchange, must all, through the whole Laconian country,

Mourn for the loss of a king, descendant of great Heracles.
He cannot be withheld by the courage of bulls or of
lions,

Strive as they may; he is mighty as Jove; there is
naught that shall stay him,

Till he have got for his prey your king, or your glorious
city.”²

This prediction caused Leonidas to stay where death was certain, and also influenced him in sending the allies away so that as much as possible of the glory should belong to the Spartans.

When the Lacedæmonians became desirous of conquering the whole of Arcadia, and sent to consult the oracle, the Pythoness turned them from their purpose with what seemed a promise of better things. But they were not satisfied to stay quiet. “Regarding the Arcadians as very much their inferiors, they sent to consult the oracle about conquering the whole of Arcadia. The Pythoness thus answered them:—

‘Cravest thou Arcady? Bold is thy craving. I shall
not content it.

Many the men that in Arcady dwell, whose food is the
acorn.

They will never allow thee. It is not I that am niggard;
I will give thee to dance in Tegea, with noisy foot fall,
And with the measuring line mete out the glorious
champaign.’

“When the Lacedæmonians received this reply, leaving the rest of Arcadia untouched, they marched against the Tegeans, carrying with them fetters, so confident had this oracle (which was in truth, but of base metal) made them that they would enslave the Tegeans. The battle,

however, went against them, and many fell into the enemy's hands. Then these persons, wearing the fetters which they had themselves brought, and fastened together in a string, measured the Tegean plain as they executed their labors. The fetters in which they worked were still, in my day, preserved at Tegea, where they hung round the walls of the temple of Minerva Alea. Throughout the whole of this early contest with the Tegeans, the Lacedæmonians met with nothing but defeats; but in the time of Crœsus, under the kings Anaxandrides and Aristo, fortune had turned in their favor, in the manner which I will now relate. Having been worsted in every engagement by their enemy, they sent to Delphi, and inquired of the oracle what god they must propitiate to prevail in the war against the Tegeans. The answer of the Pythoness was, that before they could prevail, they must remove to Sparta the bones of Orestes, the son of Agamemnon. Unable to discover his burial-place, they sent a second time, and asked the god where the body of the hero had been laid. The following was the answer they received:—

'Level and smooth is the plain where Arcadian Tegea standeth;

There two winds are ever, by strong necessity, blowing,
Counter-stroke answers stroke, and evil lies upon evil.

There all-teeming Earth doth harbor the son of Atrides,
Bring thou him to thy city, and then be Tegea's master.'

"After this reply, the Lacedæmonians were no nearer discovering the burial-place than before, though they continued to search for it diligently; until at last a man named Lichas, one of the Spartans, called Agathoërgi, found it. The Agathoërgi are citizens who have just

served their time among the knights. The five eldest of the knights go out every year, and are bound during the year after their discharge, to go wherever the state sends them, and actively employ themselves in its service. Lichas was one of this body, when, partly by good luck, partly by his own wisdom, he discovered the burial-place. Intercourse between the two states existing just at this time, he went to Tegea, and, happening to enter into the workshop of a smith, he saw him forging some iron. As he stood marveling at what he beheld, he was observed by the smith, who, leaving off his work, went up to him and said: ‘Certainly, then, you Spartan stranger, you would have been wonderfully surprised if you had seen what I have, since you make a marvel even of the working in iron. I wanted to make myself a well in this room, and began to dig it, when, what think you? I came upon a coffin seven cubits long. I had never believed that men were taller in the olden times than they are now, so I opened the coffin. The body inside was of the same length; I measured it, and filled up the hole again.’ Such was the man’s account of what he had seen. The other, on turning the matter over in his mind, conjectured that this was the body of Orestes, of which the oracle had spoken. He guessed so because he observed that the smithy had two bellows, which he understood to be the two winds, and the hammer and anvil would do for the stroke and the counter-stroke, and the iron that was being wrought for the evil lying upon evil. This he imagined might be so because iron had been discovered to the hurt of man. Full of these conjectures, he sped back to Sparta and laid the whole matter before his countrymen. Soon after, by a concerted plan, they brought a charge against him and began a

prosecution. Lichas betook himself to Tegea, and on his arrival acquainted the smith with his misfortune, and proposed to rent his room of him. The smith refused for some time; but at last Lichas persuaded him, and took up his abode in it. Then he opened the grave, and, collecting the bones, returned with them to Sparta. From henceforth, whenever the Spartans and the Tegeans made trial of each other's skill in arms, the Spartans always had greatly the advantage; and by the time to which we are come now, they were master of most of the Peloponnesus.”³

After Timoleon had taken command of the Corinthian expedition to relieve Syracuse, and when the weakness of his forces led to the general expectation that he would fail, he went to Delphi and inquired of the oracle whether he would succeed. Not only did he receive an encouraging reply, “but while he was actually in the temple, a fillet with intertwined wreaths and symbols of victory fell from one of the statues upon his head. The priestesses of Persephone learned from the goddess in a dream that she was about to sail with Timoleon for Sicily, her own favorite island. Accordingly he caused a new special trireme to be fitted out, sacred to the two goddesses (Demeter and Persephone) who were about to accompany him. And when, after leaving Corcyra, the squadron struck across for a night voyage to the Italian coast, this sacred trireme was seen illumined with a blaze of light from heaven; while a burning torch on high, similar to that which was usually carried in the Eleusinian mysteries, ran along with the ship and guided the pilot to the proper landing-place at Metapontum. Such manifestations of divine presence and encouragement, properly certified and commented upon by the prophets, rendered

the voyage one of universal hopefulness to the armament."⁴ Never were prophecies more speedily or splendidly fulfilled. In many contingencies, Timoleon achieved success far beyond the expectations of himself or of his companions; and there was a general belief among the Greeks of his time that he owed all his greatest triumphs to the interposition of the gods in his favor.

It will be observed that in most of the cases here mentioned the responses were given in, or the precise phrasology of the poetical response was preserved to, historical times. Another response, given by an oracle in Asia Minor, deserves a place with these from Delphi. The religious sentiment of Greece made it a sacred duty to protect suppliants; but when some Lydians fleeing from Cyrus became suppliants in the small city of Cyme, the danger of resisting the conqueror was so great that an agent named Aristodicus was sent to a neighboring oracle for advice. On his arrival at the shrine of the god, Aristodicus, speaking on behalf of the whole body, thus addressed the oracle: "O king, Pactyas, the Lydian, threatened by the Persians with a violent death, has come to us for sanctuary, and lo, they ask him at our hands, calling upon our nation to deliver him up. Now, though we greatly dread the Persian power, yet have we not been bold to give up our suppliant, till we have certain knowledge of thy mind, what thou wouldest have us to do." The oracle, questioned several times, gave the same answer, bidding them surrender Pactyas to the Persians; whereupon Aristodicus, who had come prepared for such an answer, proceeded to make the circuit of the temple, and to take all the nests of young sparrows and other birds that he could find about the building. As he was thus employed, a voice, it is said,

came forth from the inner sanctuary, addressing Aristodicus in these words: "Most impious of men, what is this thou hast the face to do? Dost thou tear my suppliants from my temple?" Aristodicus, at no loss for a reply, rejoined: "O king, art thou so ready to protect thy suppliants, and dost thou command the Cymæans to give up a suppliant?" "Yes," returned the god, "I do command it, that so for the impiety you may the sooner perish, and not come here again to consult my oracle about the surrender of suppliants."⁵ The idea that dictated the first responses was that men, who doubted the duty of protecting suppliants at every risk to themselves, were so impious that they deserved destruction.

SEC. 397. *Greek Burials, etc.*—The Greeks disposed of the corpses of their freemen with the most devout care. After the body had been washed and dressed in a shroud of white linen, it was laid out on a bed, crowned with flowers, and then watched at its side and mourned through one whole day and the following night by four women relatives. The next morning at sunrise the body was taken to the tomb or to the funeral pile, accompanied by a procession of the male relatives, slaves and friends, near female relatives, other women at least sixty years of age, hired mourners, and flute players. There was a factitious burial for bodies lost at sea, and for soldiers slain in battle under such circumstances that the corpses could not be obtained. There was no funeral service for criminals and persons struck dead by lightning.

Cremation and burial were both practiced, the former being the more frequent. The coffin for burial was of wood, pottery, or stone. In the mouth of the dead man a small copper coin was placed to pay the ferriage across the Styx. Earthen vessels containing wine and bread

were put into the grave or placed on the funeral pile; and on the third day friends went to the grave, or to the urn containing the ashes of the dead, to adorn it with flowers and ribbons, and to make offerings of milk, honey, wine, olives, and flowers. Sometimes a pyre was built, covered with a banquet and flowers, and then burned. Similar ceremonies were repeated on the anniversaries of the person's birth and death, and also on the day, which came in the autumn, observed generally as the feast of the dead. Funeral monuments were erected at the roadside outside of the city gate, so that everybody coming in or going out should be reminded of the deceased. He who found an unburied corpse must bury it, or at least throw three handfuls of earth upon it. Graves were sacred.

CHAPTER XXV.

LITERATURE AND ART.

SECTION 398. *Homer*.—In many branches of literature the ancient Greeks reached an excellence not approached before, and in some, not excelled since. Among epic poets, Homer is unquestionably the first, as is Demosthenes among the orators of the bar. Thucydides, as a historian, Æschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, as tragic dramatists, Aristophanes as a comic poet, Socrates as a dialectician, Plato as a metaphysician, Aristotle as a biologist and inductive philosopher, and Epicurus and Zeno as moral philosophers, are among the greatest names in literature; and many of them are the original organizers of their respective departments. The very language that the Greeks used took the impress of a brilliant national genius. By many scholars, the Attic dialect has been praised as the most forcible, precise, and beautiful of all tongues for the expression of human thought. Felton says of it: “It was the most flexible and transparent body in which human thought has ever been clothed.”

The Attic dialect became the language of Greek literature. Most of the great authors of the Hellenic blood were Athenians by birth, and of those born elsewhere, a majority spent much of their time in Athens. Not only in speech, but also in architecture and plastic art, in tragedy and comedy, in oratory and history, in lyric poetry

and in social customs, the taste of Athens was accepted throughout Greece as the highest standard of correctness. This Attic taste or Atticism has been defined as an “exquisite feeling for the right tone and natural proportion; an effort to obtain pliancy without softness, grace without affectation, the love of sober and refined elegance; and all these gifts put at the service of a rich, original, and unfettered imagination.”

In nearly every department of literature known to the ancients, the Greeks produced some work of great merit. As pleas of an advocate, the orations of Demosthenes are unapproached. In its substance, the oration of Pericles, at the funeral of the Athenians slain at Samos, is the most impressive address ever spoken on a public occasion. By many able critics the history of Thucydides is considered the greatest work of its kind. Since the ancient Greeks disappeared as a distinct nationality, in no important department of letters except in prose romance, can the moderns claim to have surpassed them.

In this work no attempt will be made to give a critical review of Greek literature. Great books, as a class, are effects, not causes, of high general culture. They have been most numerous when the nation which produced them was about to decline. So it was in ancient Athens and Rome; so it was in medieval Florence; and so it has been in several modern nations. The ages of Pericles, Augustus, and Lorenzo de Medici were the culminating periods of their respective countries. The most splendid blooming of literature did not exhaust the people, but it came when they were about to be exhausted by other influences. The poetry of Homer, the dramatic productions of Æschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, the history of Thucydides, and the oratory of Demosthenes

have done much for human enlightenment, but their direct effects on human life, distinctly stimulating numerous branches of culture in many nations, cannot be traced, as can those of the democracy of Athens, the aristocracy of Rome, the foundation of Christianity, the constitution of England, the discovery of America, the invention of the printing press and of the steam engine.

Those books, which directly affect constitutional or civil law, industrial art, scientific knowledge, ecclesiastical institutions, or philosophic system, so far as their effects, in these directions, can be clearly traced, come within the domain of the history of culture; others, like the productions of architectural, plastic, pictorial, and musical art, belong mainly to special criticism.

The first literary compositions of the Greeks were in verse, and of these, the oldest now preserved are the Homeric poems. The traditions in reference to the birth-place of Homer are conflicting, but he is more intimately associated with Chios, where he spent part of his life, than with any other city, though it was Athens that did the most to preserve his poems. There they were first arranged, edited, written out in their present shape, and appreciated as works of enduring interest and of eminent literary value.

Of his two epics, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the former is universally recognized by critics, as the most admirable production of its class. Much has been written to prove that it is a compilation of a series of ballads which the Greek bards were in the habit of reciting or singing at popular festivals; but the preponderant opinion is that it was composed by one author on a plan that possessed the merits of unity and high interest.

In regard to the general merits of the Homeric epic,

Grote writes: "They are of all poems the most absolutely and unreservedly popular. . . . The most unlettered hearer of those times could readily seize, while the most instructed reader can still recognize, the characteristic excellence of Homeric narrative,—its straightforward, unconscious, unstudied simplicity, its concrete forms of speech and happy alternation of action with dialogue,—its vivid pictures of living agents, always clearly and sharply individualized, whether in the commanding proportions of Achilles and Odysseus, or in the graceful presence of Helen and Penelope, or in the more humble contrast of Eumæus and Melanthius; and always, moreover, animated by the frankness with which his heroes give utterance to all their transient emotions, and even all their infirmities,—its constant reference to those coarser veins of feeling and palpable motives which belong to all men in common; its fullness of graphic details, freshly drawn from the visible and audible world, and though often homely, never tame, nor trenching on that limit of satiety to which the Greek mind was so keenly alive; lastly, its perpetual junction of gods and men in the same picture, and familiar appeal to ever present divine agency, in harmony with the interpretation of nature at that time universal."²

"The two [Homeric poems] which remain are quite sufficient to demonstrate in the primitive Greeks, a mental organization unparalleled in any other people, and powers of invention and expression which prepared, as well as foreboded, the future eminence of the nation in all the various departments to which thought and language can be applied. Great as the power of thought afterwards became among the Greeks, their power of expression was still greater. In the former, other nations have built on

their foundations and surpassed them; in the latter, they still remain unrivaled. It is not too much to say that this flexible, emphatic, and transparent character of the language as an instrument of communication, its perfect aptitude for narrative and discussion, as well as for stirring all the veins of human emotion without ever forfeiting that character of simplicity which adapts it to all men and all times, may be traced mainly to the existence and widespread influence of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.³

SEC. 399. *The Greek Drama*.—Dramatic exhibitions may have appeared in Egypt, China, or Babylon, before they did in Greece, but the earliest known to history were in the latter country. There the drama was an original product of the native mind, and there it reached an excellence unapproached elsewhere before modern times. The first trace of a theatrical performance appeared in the annual festival of Bacchus, at Athens, in which a chorus sang a song or poem descriptive of events, with comments on the conduct of some personages mentioned in the story. The entertainment was religious in origin and character, and the song was marked by an elevated moral tone which was preserved in all the tragic compositions of the Greeks.

Eschylus, an Athenian who became distinguished as a tragic poet early in the Vth century B. C., made an important innovation in the literary entertainment of the Bacchic festival. Instead of having a continuous song by the chorus, he introduced an actor who sang or recited a solo part, in dialogue with the chorus. Thus the drama succeeded to the ballad. The actor became the hero of the plot; and the chorus gave voice to public opinion, questioning, criticising, approving, or condemning the actions brought to their notice.

A little later than Æschylus, but contemporaneous with him for many years, was Sophocles, who introduced a second actor on the stage, so that it may be said that with the leader of the chorus, and the chorus, he had four actors on the stage at the same time. Euripides, who was born when Æschylus was forty-five, and Sophocles sixteen years old, introduced another actor. This was the last improvement in that direction made by ancient tragedians. Since the actors wore masks, they could assume different characters in successive scenes.

In Athens, and probably in other leading Grecian cities, the performance of a tragedy was an act of worship paid by the state to god Dionysus, or Bacchus. The government built the theater, managed the performance, employed the actors, trained the chorus, selected the pieces, and paid actors and dramatists. Although the god of wine does not seem to modern thought a good representative of severe morality, the dramatic performances given in his honor in ancient Greece, were pervaded by a severe ethical spirit. A Greek tragedy abounded with impressive teachings of justice and pity. Of the productions of Æschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, Grote says: "So powerful a body of poetical influence has probably never been brought to act upon the emotions of any other population; and when we consider the extraordinary beauty of these immortal compositions, which first stamped tragedy as a separate department of poetry, and gave to it a dignity never since reached, we shall be satisfied that the tastes, the sentiments, and the intellectual standard of the Athenian multitude must have been sensibly improved and exalted by such lessons."¹

It was in Greece that the first theater was erected.

This structure had a capacity to seat 30,000 spectators, and was not larger than the average ancient theater, though ten times as large as the modern. The shape was semicircular; the seats were of stone; and there was no roof, but there were awnings which could be drawn across the top of the building to shield the stage and the best seats from the sun. There was no curtain and no sliding scenery; but there were several scenes on pivots, so arranged that an idea could be given of the different places; and after the middle of the Vth century B. C., some of these scenes were painted in linear perspective which was discovered by an Athenian scene painter while engaged in his business of trying to represent streets and the interiors of buildings in a manner true to his subjects.

The great multitude of spectators made it necessary to give to thousands seats at such a distance from the stage that they could neither see the features of the actor's face, nor hear his voice in the ordinary tone of speaking. It was partly because of the great size of the theaters, that, on the ancient stage, the actors wore masks, of which there was one for each of the leading emotions represented, including anger, hatred, sorrow, mirth, and joy; and these masks were so large and had the expression so strongly marked that their meaning was clearly discernible. They were shaped in such a manner that they served as speaking trumpets to make the voices more resonant. The text of the play was not spoken in an ordinary tone, but most of it was recited, chanted, or sung, and was thus made intelligible to distant auditors. All the performers were men; and in selecting them, attention was paid to strength of voice; and a considerable part of the text was intrusted to a chorus.

The performances were not given every day, nor in a number of theaters at the same time, nor in the evening; but rarely, for some few days in the year. The Greeks were early risers, and sunrise was a favorite hour for opening courts, theaters, and public meetings, partly because the people generally had no means of measuring time precisely, and that hour was more easily ascertainable than any other of the day save sunset; which latter being soon followed by darkness, was unsuitable for meetings that might last several hours.

The Athenian tragedy was religious, and its performance was preceded by some brief act of worship, such as burning incense and offering flowers and a libation of wine to the god. In Athens several tragedies by different authors were produced in competition on successive days; and each author had his own chorus and set of actors; and each chorus was under the management of some prominent citizen who had selected them and provided for their musical training in the part assigned to them. The poetical, the dramatic, the musical, and the spectacular effects were associated with personal, political, and religious influences, for a highly devout tone ran through many of the tragedies, and contributed to the intense feeling with which the plays were witnessed.

SEC. 400. *Socrates*.—Philosophic thought about the origin of the universe and the nature of existence made its appearance among the Hellenes, in Asia Minor and in Italy, before it attracted attention in Greece proper. One philosopher supposed that the universe was developed out of water; another believed that it originated in air; and a third that it came out of fire. Zenó, of Italy, adopted the rudiments of a system of dialectical argument; Protagoras declared that man is the measure of

all things, meaning that conformity to his perception and reason is the standard of truth; and Xenophanes argued that perceptions are delusive and that reason alone can be trusted for discovering the relations of man to his surroundings. Empedocles, of Sicily, denounced the popular myths about the wars, loves, and romantic adventures of the gods as demoralizing and disgraceful to humanity. Anaxagoras, of Asia Minor, while admitting that the perceptions needed to be corrected by reason, declared that the senses are the sources of all knowledge; that man cannot discover anything beyond phenomena; that nature is the proper subject of his study; that the heavenly bodies are balls of matter similar in substance to that of our earth—the sun being white hot and the moon cold—and that the universe is an animal pervaded by a vital principle. Such were some of the gropings that laid the foundations for the philosophical schools of Athens.

Among the great thinkers who taught in that city, five are notable as the organizers of systems. These are Socrates, the dialectician and social philosopher; Plato, the metaphysical philosopher; Aristotle, the scientific and political philosopher; Epicurus, the utilitarian moralist; and Zeno, the Stoic moralist. Socrates gave his instruction in the streets and public places, to all persons who might be present when he had anything to say. The other four had each an educational institution in which he gave lectures to a class of students.

Most of the Greeks who first became famous as philosophers were natives of Asia Minor, Italy, and Sicily; but in the latter part of the Vth century B. C., Athens obtained general recognition as the center of education, and she became the site where all the greatest philoso-

phers of the Grecian world maintained their schools, taught their systems, and wrote, or found writers for, their ideas. The “abundance and variety of speculative genius and invention are among the most memorable facts in the history of the Hellenic mind. The prompting of intelligent curiosity, the thirst for some plausible hypothesis to explain the Cosmos and its generation, the belief that a basis or point of departure might be found in the Cosmos itself, apart from those mythical personifications which dwelt both in the popular mind and in the poetical theogonies, the mental effort required to select some known agency, and to connect it by a chain of reasoning with the result—all this is a new phenomenon in the history of the human mind.”¹

It was in the last quarter of the Vth century B. C., that Socrates became one of the most famous men of Athens. Fond of argument, extremely skillful in it, and blessed with an abundance of leisure, he devoted a large part of his time to disputation with men of intelligence, selecting as preferred subjects of inquiry, fundamental questions of dialectical, ethical, social, and political philosophy. He sought as controversialists those men who laid claim to superior wisdom and learning, and with such men his victory was usually easy. His method was greatly admired by his friends, by whom he was usually attended; but not unfrequently it gave much offense to those whom he had vanquished. He himself was relatively secure because of his skill in selecting the subjects, and in directing the course of the discussion, and because of his refusal to make himself responsible for vulnerable propositions. His main object was to show that people claimed more knowledge than they possessed, and that they habitually made assertions

without sufficient evidence. He distinctly declared that he was ignorant upon many of the points about which his adversaries claimed positive knowledge; and he attributed his advantage in debate to his knowledge of his own ignorance.

Socrates had no place where he taught at regularly recurring times; he had no special house or grounds for his lessons; he did not deliver systematic courses of lectures; he did not charge for tuition. And yet he had many pupils who went to him frequently for instruction, and who recognized him as their master. They sought his company every day; they accompanied him in his walks; they listened to his conversations with others, and not unfrequently themselves addressed questions to him. He never wrote anything, nor requested anyone to write what he had taught; but among his pupils were two men, Plato and Xenophon, who afterwards became famous, and who undertook to explain his teaching; and their writings about Socrates are among the treasures of Greek literature.

Although the most notable original feature in the teaching of Socrates was his dialectical system of seeking for truth, yet he gave much prominence also to morals. For him happiness was the purpose of life, and ethics the guide to its approximate acquisition. Morality, as conceived by him, was based on experience. That rule which was not approved by human observation and reason, had for him no ethical authority. The act which was injurious to the community yielded no pleasure to him. He gave to his neighbor that considerate regard which was indispensable to his own satisfaction in life. He owed much of his enjoyment to society, and he could not be content with himself unless he was conscious

that he had contributed a fair share to the common stock of social service. He considered it a duty to earn the affection of his neighbors as much as to earn his bread. He would not be a burden on the community in either respect. Whether a wrong was small or great, he would rather be its victim than its perpetrator. He said, "Even though others do evil to us, we ought not to do evil to them in return." Nor was this mere talk. It was the rule by which he lived. He was an excellent friend, citizen, political official, and soldier. As senator and as soldier he repeatedly risked his life, and showed the most heroic bravery, and the most generous devotion to his friends. And they, in return, looked up to him with affectionate veneration for his character as well as with high admiration for his capacity.

The circumstances of the death of Socrates add greatly to the interest of his life. Indicted and tried for impiety, an offense of which he was never guilty, he was convicted and sentenced to death. By appealing to the pity of the jury he might have obtained a verdict of acquittal; by making some concessions to their prejudices he might have induced them to impose some light punishment; and by accepting the aid of his friends he could have escaped after sentence was pronounced. But he would do none of these things. In his address to the jury which sentenced him to death, by a majority of about half a dozen out of the whole number of two hundred, he said:

"Strange, indeed, would be my conduct, O men of Athens, if I, who, when I was ordered by the generals whom you chose to command me at Potidæa and Amphipolis and Delium, remained where they placed me, like any other man, facing death; if, I say, now, when, as I conceive and imagine, God orders me to fulfill the phi-

losopher's mission of searching into myself and other men, I were to desert my post through fear of death, or any other fear; that would indeed be strange, and I might justly be arraigned in court for denying the existence of the gods, if I disobeyed the oracle because I was afraid of death; then I should be fancying that I was wise when I was not wise. For this fear of death is indeed the pretense of wisdom, and not real wisdom, being the appearance of knowing the unknown; since no one knows whether death, which they in their fear apprehend to be the greatest evil, may not be the greatest good. Is there not here conceit of knowledge, which is a disgraceful sort of ignorance? And this is the point in which, as I think, I am superior to men in general, and in which I might perhaps fancy myself wiser than other men,—that whereas I know but little of the world below, I do not suppose that I know; but I do know that injustice and disobedience to a better, whether God or man, is evil and dishonorable, and I will never fear or avoid a possible good rather than a certain evil. And therefore if you let me go now, and reject the counsels of Anytus, who said that if I were not put to death I ought not to have been prosecuted, and that if I escape now your sons will all be utterly ruined by listening to my words—if you say to me, 'Socrates, this time we will not mind Anytus, and will let you off, but upon one condition, that you are not to inquire and speculate in this way any more, and that if you are caught doing this again you shall die;' if this was the condition on which you let me go, I should reply: 'Men of Athens, I honor and love you, but I shall obey God rather than you, and while I have life and strength I shall never cease from the practice and teaching of philosophy, exhorting anyone whom I meet after

my manner, and convincing him, saying: O my friend, why do you, who are a citizen of the great and mighty and wise city of Athens, care so much about laying up the greatest amount of money, and honor, and reputation, and so little about wisdom and truth, and the greatest improvement of the soul, which you never regard or heed at all? Are you not ashamed of this?" And if the person with whom I am arguing, says: "Yes, but I do care;" I do not depart or let him go at once; I interrogate and examine and cross-examine him, and if I think that he has no virtue, but only says that he has, I reproach him with undervaluing the greater, and overvaluing the less. And this I should say to everyone whom I meet, young and old, citizen and alien, but especially to the citizens, inasmuch as they are my brethren. For this is the command of God, as I would have you know; and I believe that to this day no greater good has ever happened in the state than my service to the God. For I do nothing but go about persuading you all, old and young alike, not to take thought for your persons or your properties, but first and chiefly to care about the greatest improvement of the soul. I tell you that virtue is not given by money, but that from virtue come money and every other good of man, public as well as private. This is my teaching, and if this is the doctrine which corrupts the youth, my influence is ruinous indeed. But if anyone says that this is not my teaching, he is speaking an untruth. Wherefore, O men of Athens, I say to you do as Anytus bids or not as Anytus bids, and either acquit me or not, but whatever you do, know that I shall never alter my ways, not even if I have to die many times."²

SEC. 401. *Socratic Philosophy*.—While the method of

Socrates was skeptical, and the general tendency of his reasoning was unfavorable to the dominion of the Greek mythology, he was a most sincere believer in the popular religion. He was not only a devout polytheist and idolater, but he supposed that the priests, augurs, and oracles acted under divine inspiration, to guide the people of Greece. He was the outspoken enemy of the theory that celestial phenomena are the results of natural law. To him the sun was a god; to call it a globe of fire was false and sacrilegious. He “deprecated astronomy and physics as unbecoming attempts to pry into the secrets of the gods, who administered the general affairs of the cosmos [universe] according to their own pleasure, and granted only through the medium of prophecy or oracles such special revelations as they saw fit.”¹

He did not attempt to introduce a new philosophical or religious creed; he had no long list of principles to which he demanded assent. His method was negative rather than positive. His teaching was explained by Aristotle to mean that “philosophy is the solution of doubts.” Some Athenians who had been repeatedly bothered by his questions denounced him and his “free argumentative discussion,” and he in turn ridiculed their “misology,” as he termed it, their hatred of words. This misology was a symptom of the false persuasion of knowledge without the reality, “a chronic malady of the human mind,” and Socrates made it one of the special objects of his ambition to cure this malady.

Socrates gave much attention to the definition of terms used in disputation; and, so far as we know, he was the first to perceive the fundamental importance of having the same word convey precisely the same idea to both sides in any argument. Aristotle says that Socrates in-

troduced two novelties into philosophy; first, inductive reasoning; and, second, the definition of general terms.² There may be reason to doubt whether Socrates fully deserved this praise; there can be no reason to doubt that it is the greatest praise that has been given to any philosopher. These two "novelties" are the greatest contributions ever made to the art of argumentation. All the notable Greek philosophers of later date were either the pupils of Socrates or the pupils of his pupils; and all subsequent philosophy, so far as it had any real value, consisted of developments or differentiations of his teaching.

He "required from no man implicit trust; nay, he deprecated it as dangerous. It is one peculiarity of the Socratic dialogues, that the sentiment of authority, instead of being invoked and worked up, as is generally done in philosophy, is formally disavowed and practically set aside."³ He was the most decided enemy of blind submission to traditional belief and inherited "custom, the king of all." To him it was evident, as it is to many modern observers, that "most of the misunderstandings and contradictions among men, most of the controversies and errors . . . arise from our assuming (consciously or unconsciously) fundamental maxims and fundamental facts, as if they were self-evident and as if they must be assumed by everyone else besides."⁴

There can be no doubt that his "individual influence permanently enlarged the horizon, improved the method, and multiplied the ascendant minds of the Grecian speculative world in a manner never since equaled."⁵ His pre-eminence as a thinker was generally recognized not only among the leading men of Athens but throughout Greece. A question addressed to the Delphic Oracle,

whether any man was wiser than Socrates, elicited a reply that no other man was wiser. The publicity of this response and the authority of the Oracle settled the matter in public opinion.

"His peculiar gift was that of cross-examination or the application of his *elenchus*, to discriminate pretended from real knowledge. He found men full of confident beliefs on these ethical and political topics—affirming with words which they had never troubled themselves to define—and persuaded that they required no further teaching; yet at the same time unable to give clear and consistent answers to his questions, and shown by this convincing test to be destitute of real knowledge. Declaring this false persuasion of knowledge, or confident unreasoned belief, to be universal, he undertook as the mission of his life to expose it; and he proclaimed that, until the mind was disabused thereof, and made painfully conscious of ignorance, no affirmative reasoned truth could be presented with any chance of success."⁶

Socrates stamped his impress on the philosophy of his time; and, in its main principles, made it the true philosophy of all time. It is owing to him that "the negative side of Grecian speculation stands quite as prominently marked, and occupies as large a measure of the intellectual force of their philosophers, as the positive side. It is not simply to arrive at a conclusion, sustained by a certain measure of plausible premise, and then to proclaim it as an authoritative dogma, silencing or disparaging all objectors, that Grecian speculation aspires. To unmask not only positive falsehood, but even affirmation without evidence, exaggerated confidence in what was only doubtful and show of knowledge without the reality;

to look at a problem on all sides and set forth all the difficulties attending its solution, to take account of deductions from the affirmative evidence, even in the case of conclusions accepted as true upon the balance, all this will be found pervading the march of their greatest thinkers. As a condition of all progressive philosophy, it is not less essential that the grounds of negation should be freely exposed than the grounds of affirmation.”⁷

SEC. 402. *Plato*.—Plato, the most distinguished pupil of Socrates, purchased a beautiful garden, known as the Academy, which he used as a place of instruction and bequeathed to the public as an educational institution. Here his pupils, who were divided into classes, as they were more or less advanced, met nearly every day for forty years, with occasional interruptions, to listen to his conversation and lectures. He charged no tuition fee, but we may presume that he sometimes accepted presents from his students. Each class elected one of its own members to the position of leader for a term of ten days; and once a month the school, or perhaps each class, had a common dinner.

As the writer of the oldest philosophical books that have been preserved to modern times, and of philosophical books written with much breadth of thought and impressiveness of style; as the author who first organized a metaphysical system of thought; as the chief expounder of the teachings and chief apologist of the character of Socrates; and as the founder of the first great philosophical school, Plato occupies a prominent place in the history of the mental growth of mankind.

“Plato was the most artistic of philosophers, and, among men of great eminence, one of the worst of investigators; not, assuredly, from deficient power, but

from his disastrous misconception of method. In spite of a certain loitering diffusiveness of style, and an oppressive circumstantiality in refuting trivial considerations, no one before Plato, no one since, has managed the extremely difficult art of dramatic debate in philosophic topics with such commanding success; and in consequence of this fascinating art, aided by the union of dialectical subtlety with mystical yearnings, a subtlety which seems to give a hope to mysticism, and a warrant to transcendentalism, no one has exercised a more pernicious influence on culture. The charm of the artist has immortalized the vices of the thinker."¹

Although the moral philosophy of Plato was adopted from the teachings of Socrates without notable modification or addition, and although it was not characteristic of the Academy, it nevertheless deserves mention as one of the features of his school, as it was in that of Aristotle. In the schools of Epicurus and Zeno it became the main feature. The spirit of the ethical teaching of all these philosophers was the same; each made experience the source, and happiness the end, of morals.

The distinctive feature of Plato's philosophy is his metaphysical ontology. He was not the first to observe that the perceptions of the senses are sometimes delusive, but he was the first to teach a comprehensive system in which their testimony is declared absolutely untrustworthy for all philosophical purposes. He denied the reality of the material universe, and recognized no absolute existence save that of ideas. Believing natural phenomena to be illusory, he turned his attention from them to his conception of the essence of things. These creations of his imagination, or, as he claimed, of his reason, were for him the chief realities of life. He not

only rejected sensation as a source of truth, but he declared it to be trivial, and misleading. He denied the value of science and of everything that can be learned through the perceptions.

Metaphysical ontology, which may be defined as the co-ordination of suppositions about the nature of absolute existence,² has had many distinguished advocates, but has made no notable progress since Plato. Having no basis in sensation, it has no new material out of which to make additions to its domain. In matters of metaphysical imagination, as in those of gustatory sensation, there is no common standard of measurement, and no secure basis for continuous progress.

SEC. 403. *Aristotle*.—Aristotle was born in the Greek colony of Stagira, Thrace, about the year 384 b. c. Having lost his father and inherited a fortune at an early age, he went to Athens to obtain an education. There he was a student in the school of Plato for at least fifteen years, and then spent five years at Mitylene, where he resided when he accepted an invitation from Philip of Macedon, to become the tutor of his son Alexander who was fourteen years of age. This position he held for three years, to the satisfaction of the pupil and his father. Alexander became greatly attached to his master, of whom he said that to him he owed his knowledge of the art of living. After reaching the throne, the youthful hero provided liberally for Aristotle, giving him, according to an untrustworthy rumor, \$800,000. He encouraged the philosopher to undertake extensive scientific researches, and ordered his hunters, gamekeepers, fishermen, and other servants, to collect such material as the Stagirite wanted for his studies. At the age of fifty, Aristotle returned to Athens and there opened his

school at the Lyceum, which had a shady walk called the Peripatos, from which his students were called the Peripatetics. Thirteen years he spent there teaching and writing. At the end of that period Alexander died, and then the Athenians showed their hatred of Aristotle.

"As a foreigner, a philosopher, and a friend of Macedon, he was trebly odious to [some of] the political leaders; and a pretext for accusation was raised on a ground where such pretexts are always easily raised and are always dangerous—irreligion. He was accused of blasphemy, and of paying divine honors to mortals. And who were these mortals he had honored? His friend and his wife. The charge may seem frivolous, but too well he knew the temper of the multitude to hope that the absurdity of the charge would be a guaranty for his safety. Mobs seldom reason, rarely examine. The blameless life and lofty soul of Socrates had been no defense against the charges of Melitus; and Aristotle quitted Athens, 'not to give the Athenians a second opportunity of committing a sacrilege against philosophy.' . . . The Athenians, on his refusal to appear in answer to the summons of the Areopagus, deprived him of citizenship, and all the honors that had been conferred on him,"¹ and sentenced him to death. He died very soon afterwards, so that the end of his teaching at Athens may be considered the end of his life.

He understood the importance of precise definitions, and he gave full praise to Socrates for his immense service to philosophy in laying down the fundamental principles that the terms used in argument should have the same exact meaning for the person speaking and for the one spoken to; and that no truth was valuable until

it had been considered skeptically and accepted after fair consideration of the adverse evidence and argument.

Although Aristotle gave to Socrates the credit of being the father of inductive philosophy, yet that credit belongs more strictly to Aristotle himself than to any other person, much more to him than to Bacon. Plato observed life from the subjective, and Aristotle from the objective, standpoint. To one, matter was a delusion, and to the other, the most important subject of study. Plato found the chief basis of truth in his unassisted reason; Aristotle found it in his perception, guided by his understanding. These two men were the first great leaders in the warfare, not yet ended, between abstract idealism and scientific positivism.

The most complete work done by Aristotle was his elaboration of the rules of formal logic, which he conceived and defined in such a manner that later writers have not been able to add anything to his treatise save in the way of amplification and elucidation. He did not discover any new test of truth or principle of reasoning, but he devised a valuable system of technical rules suitable for applying sound principles of argument, previously well understood, to special problems.

Aristotle had an encyclopedic knowledge of the science and philosophy of his time, and to the former he contributed much. His researches in comparative anatomy, his acute original observations, and his compilations of all the zoological and botanical knowledge of his predecessors, give him a position of great eminence in the history of the intellectual development of Greece.

He made the first attempt, known to us, to define life. He described it as "the primary result of an organism," and as the "possession of the faculties of self-nourish-

ment, self-growth, and self-decay.” He and his contemporaries did not understand the analogies between fire and life, and therefore he could not, as we can, say that life is a slow combustion in a moist body which supplies itself automatically with fuel.

He had meditated much on the progressive complexity of life, and he observed many of the traces of kinship between animals of different classes. He saw that the bird’s feather and the fish’s scale, the crab’s claw and the man’s hand, have analogous functions. In his treatise he made “one of the earliest attempts to found biology on comparative anatomy.” He distinctly observed epigenesis, the formation of one organ after another in the course of anatomical development; and he mentioned all the forms of reproduction save that of spontaneous fission.²

He distinguished quadrupeds, birds, fishes, and insects, but had no conception of class, order, family, genus, and species as understood in recent biology; and he objected to any classification based on “the principle of negation,” as if negation were not the inseparable correlative of affirmation in scientific investigation.

Aristotle understood the “parallelogram of forces;” and also the principle of virtual velocity, as illustrated in the movements of the different ends of a lever, though he failed to appreciate its importance. He observed the influence of momentum, but did not understand its cause. He was puzzled by the facts that more effort is required to move a stationary than a moving cart, and that wood can be split by an ax impelled by a strong momentum and not by an ax laid on the wood gently.

Although he did much scientific work in accordance with the principle of induction, he also did much other

work in the metaphysical spirit, trusting to presumptions. Thus he said that the principle of perfection in nature implies that all movements are naturally circular; and therefore the necessary form of the heavens [and of the planetary orbits] is a circle, for this form is the most suitable for its substance.³

He described the internal organs of man, but as he had never systematically dissected the human body, many of his statements are "meager and inaccurate." Thus he said that some men have gall bladders and others have not; that "of all living creatures man has the coldest left side;" that "the office of the sutures is to permit the escape of vapors from the brain;" that man alone has a heart-beat "because he alone is moved by hope and expectation;" that children sleep much "because all their food is carried upwards;" that the seat of sensation is in the heart; and that the taste of blood in a healthy condition is sweet and its color red, but "when of inferior quality or damaged by sickness, is black."⁴ His remark about the color of the blood was presumably suggested by the observation that the venous blood drawn by surgeons from sick people was darker than that flowing from severed arteries. Not knowing that there are two kinds of blood in the body, one bright red, flowing from the heart through the arteries, and the other dark red, flowing towards the heart through the veins, he imagined that the darker blood drawn in sickness was itself a symptom of disease. The optic, auditory, and olfactory nerves were familiar to him, but their functions in transmitting sensation were not known; and he had no conception of the nervous system.

"After every deduction has been made, the instinctive and popular appreciation of his greatness will be ratified

by a large philosophy. Among the great heroes of humanity, his position must ever remain conspicuous. He claims precedence over hundreds who, under more fortunate conditions, have enriched science with priceless details. He rises superior to most of those who have illuminated science with great conceptions. And this superiority is claimed not only in virtue of his many achievements, but also in virtue of his native force. His comprehensive glance embraced the whole field of research; and if some other philosophers, ancient and modern, have taken as wide a survey, none have, like him, first opened the pathways they surveyed."⁵

SEC. 404. *Epicurus*.—The philosophical school of Epicurus was established in Athens near the close of the IVth century B. C., and for thirty-six years was under the management of its founder. For five centuries after his death it continued to flourish. The bulk of his teaching was ethical; but his moral doctrines were little more than an amplification of those of Socrates. He taught that virtue or a just regard for others is indispensable to the enjoyment of life; that we cannot be happy unless we abstain from cruelty, violence, fraud, insolence, and all forms of trespass on the equal rights of our fellow-men. Persons of narrow mind may obtain brief gratifications from vice or crime, but they embitter the general tenor of their lives and deprive themselves of many of the higher pleasures. Virtue with Epicurus is a means, not an end. It pays for itself; it pays largely. It is "the indispensable condition of everyone's comfort."¹

There is a distinct originality in Epicurus. He was the first to make the teaching of ethics the main business of a great educational institution; the first to declare that experience is the only proper guide of a high and pure

morality; the first to denounce as pernicious all appeals to supernatural considerations; and the first and only teacher among the Greeks to found an ethical doctrine which, in its main features, still has a multitude of adherents among enlightened men.

His object was to reach the highest enjoyment of which life is capable, and to sustain himself in that condition through the longest possible period; and as means to that end, he considered it indispensable to conduct himself in such a manner that he should contribute to the happiness of everybody around him. The state of mind which resulted from the observance of this rule was, in his phraseology, pleasure.

According to Epicurus, true happiness "is not the enjoyment of the moment, but the enjoyment of the whole life. We must not seek to intensify, but to equalize; not debauchery to-day and satiety to-morrow, but equable enjoyment all the year round. No life can be pleasant except a virtuous life; and the pleasures of the body, although not to be despised, are insignificant when compared with those of the soul. The former are but momentary; the latter embrace both the past and future. Hence the golden rule of temperance. Epicurus not only insisted on the necessity of moderation for continued enjoyment, he also slighted and somewhat scorned all exquisite indulgences. He fed moderately and plainly. Without interdicting luxuries, he saw that pleasure was purer and more enduring if luxuries were dispensed with. This is the ground upon which cynics and stoics built their own exaggerated systems. They also saw that simplicity was preferable to luxury; but they pushed their notion too far. Contentedness with a little, Epicurus regarded as a great good; and he said wealth consisted not

in having great possessions but in having small wants. He did not limit man to the fewest possible enjoyments; on the contrary, he wished him in all ways to multiply them; but he wished him to be able to live upon little, both as a preventive against ill fortune, and as an enhancement of rare enjoyments. The man who lives plainly has no fear of poverty, and is better able to enjoy exquisite pleasures.”²

In a noble system of morality, friendship has a prominent place; and it had such a place in the teaching of Epicurus. He appreciated the vast importance of kindly offices rendered by man to man for the sake of their common humanity, and of that spirit of mutual aid which contributes greatly to make life enjoyable. “No one except a wise man [he said] knew how to return a favor properly.”³

His “exhortations to active friendship were not unfruitful. We know, even by the admission of witnesses adverse to the Epicurean doctrines, that the harmony among the members of the sect, with common veneration for the founder, was more marked and more enduring than that exhibited by any other of the philosophical sects. . . . The Epicurean sect still continued its numbers and dignity [four hundred and fifty years after the death of Epicurus], having outlasted its contemporaries and rivals.”⁴

In his tranquil garden, “in the society of his friends, he passed a peaceful life of speculation and enjoyment. The friendship which existed amongst them is well known. In a time of general scarcity and famine they contributed to each other’s support, showing that the Pythagorean notion of community of goods was unnecessary amongst friends, who could confide in each other.

At the entrance of the garden they placed this inscription: ‘The hospitable keeper of this mansion, where you will find pleasure the highest good, will present you liberally with barley cakes, and water fresh from the spring. The gardens will not provoke your appetite by artificial dainties, but satisfy it with natural supplies. Will you not be well entertained?’’⁵

In accordance with his rule that man should be content with little and should not continually hanker after new gratifications difficult of attainment for the successful few, and inaccessible for the many, Epicurus advised his pupils not to strive for political honors. The phraseology of his instruction on this point has not been preserved, and his precise meaning is doubtful. His enemies accused him of advising his students to shirk the duties of citizenship; but they accused him also, and without truth, of teaching them to live by the rule of mean selfishness, without regard for the rights of others. There is a great difference between a greedy strife for political office, and a base avoidance of it when offered by the public voice, or imposed by public duty. Socrates did not scheme for it, and he did not shirk it; and the general tenor of the ethics of Epicurus leads us to infer that his teaching on this point was in harmony with the doctrine and conduct of Socrates. It is worthy of note that while Epicurus was at the head of his school, Athens was subject to Macedonian influence, and political office there was often accessible only to those who would be more or less subservient to despots. It is possible that he gave advice to abstain from state affairs, but intended it only for local and temporary application; and there is also a possibility that the later masters in the Epicurean school, under the dominion of Rome,

misrepresented the doctrine of its founder on this point. Certain it is, on the other hand, that Lucretius, the best interpreter of the teaching of Epicurus, and its ablest advocate, was not in favor of shirking any patriotic duty.

Epicurus taught some principles of physics. He saw that matter is self-existent and eternal; that it never was created and never will be destroyed; that it consists of atoms which are in constant motion, and which, by their inherent qualities, acting under invariable natural laws, are the sources of all natural phenomena, including life. As Lucretius, the best expositor of Epicurus, expresses it, "atoms are the seeds of things;"⁶ and he adds that many monsters were born in the course of time, but that only those fit for the conditions of nature survived; and thus he suggests the recent doctrine of natural selection.⁷ "Nothing," according to Lucretius, "is ever begotten out of nothing by divine power," and again he tells us that atoms are "strong in solid singleness;" and that "it is absolutely decreed, according to the conditions of nature, what each thing can do and what it cannot do."⁸ These phrases come very near to the suggestion of the conservation of energy; they plainly convey the idea of all-pervading natural law; and they are remarkably near to many of the ideas established in the domain of science by the investigations of the XIXth century. They remind us of the structural power of matter in Tyndall, and of his phrase that "it is matter and only matter which grows up from the seed into the oak, from the embryo into the perfect animal or man."⁹

Epicurus gave a prominent place in his teaching to doctrines in relation to the gods. He denounced as false the theology current among the Greeks and the barbarous nations known to him. He considered it

pernicious to believe in gods as the vulgar conceive them; and it is demoralizing to suppose that they grant their highest favors not to the just but to the most abject followers of the priests. In his opinion “the chief miseries of life arose, not from bodily pains, but partly from delusions of hope, and exaggerated aspirations for wealth, honors, power, etc., in all which the objects appeared more seductive from a distance, inciting man to lawless violence and treachery, while in the reality they were always disappointments and generally something worse; partly, and still more, from the delusions of fear. Of this last sort were the two greatest torments of human existence—fear of death and of eternal suffering after death, as announced by prophets and poets, and fear of the gods. Epicurus, who did not believe in the continued existence of the soul separate from the body, declared that there could never be any rational ground for fearing death, since it was simply a permanent extinction of consciousness. Death was nothing to us (he said); when death comes, we are no more, either to suffer or to enjoy. Yet it was the groundless fear of this nothing that poisoned all the tranquillity of life, and held men imprisoned even when existence was a torment. Whoever had surmounted that fear was armed at once against cruel tyranny and against all the gravest misfortunes. Next, the fear of the gods was not less delusive, and hardly less tormenting, than the fear of death. It was a capital error . . . to suppose that the gods employed themselves as agents in working or superintending the march of the Cosmos; or in conferring favor on some men, and administering chastisement to others.

“The vulgar religious tales, which represented them

in this character, were untrue and insulting as regards the gods themselves, and pregnant with perversion and misery as regards the hopes and fears of mankind. Epicurus believed sincerely in the gods; reverenced them as beings at once perfectly happy, immortal, and unchangeable, and took delight in the public religious festivals and ceremonies. But it was inconsistent with these attributes, and repulsive to his feelings of reverence, to conceive them as agents. The idea of agency is derived from human experience; we, as agents, act with a view to supply some want, to fulfill some obligation, to acquire some pleasure, to accomplish some object desired but not yet attained—in short, to fill up one or other of the many gaps in our imperfect happiness; the gods already have all that agents strive to get, and more than agents ever do get; their condition is one not of agency, but of tranquil, self-sustaining, fruition. Accordingly, Epicurus thought (as Aristotle had thought before him) that the perfect, eternal, and imperturbable well-being and felicity of the gods excluded the supposition of their being agents. He looked upon them as types of that unmolested safety, and unalloyed satisfaction, which was what he understood by pleasure or happiness, as objects of reverential envy, whose sympathy he was likely to obtain by assimilating his own temper and condition to theirs as far as human circumstances allowed.

“These theological views were placed by Epicurus in the foreground of his ethical philosophy, as the only means of dispelling those fears of the gods that the current fables instilled into everyone, and that did so much to destroy human comfort and security. He proclaimed that beings in immortal felicity neither suffered

vexation in themselves nor caused vexation to others ; neither showed anger nor favor to particular persons. The doctrine that they were the working managers in the affairs of the Cosmos, celestial and terrestrial, human and extra-human, he not only repudiated as incompatible with their attributes, but declared to be impious, considering the disorder, sufferings, and violence everywhere visible. He disallowed all prophecy, divination, and oracular inspiration, by which the public around him believed that the gods were perpetually communicating special revelations to individuals, and for which Socrates had felt so peculiarly thankful."¹⁰

Epicurus made a bitter opposition to the sacerdotal influence and theory of life; and his followers praised him as the liberator of humanity from the bondage of ecclesiastical superstition. Thus Lucretius says: "When human life lay shamefully groveling upon the earth, crushed down under the weight of religion, who showed her face from heaven, frowning upon mortals from on high, with awful aspect, a man of Greece was the first who ventured to lift mortal eyes to her face and to withstand her openly. . . . Religion is put beneath our feet and trampled on in him; us his victory raises to heaven." Elsewhere Lucretius tells us that "there is no holiness in being often seen to turn oneself with veiled head towards a stone and to approach every altar and to fall prostrate on the ground and to spread out one's palms before the statues of the gods and sprinkle the altars with much blood of beasts and link vow on to vow; rather it is to be able to look on all things with a mind at peace."¹¹

SEC. 405. *Stoicism*.—Later in its origin, by some few years, than the school of Epicurus, was that of Zeno,

a native of Cyprus. His place of instruction in Athens was called the Stoæ, and his pupils were designated as the Stoics. His teaching was mainly ethical and differed little from the moral doctrines of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and Epicurus; but it was accompanied by theological ideas which gave to it a peculiar character. He taught a devout recognition of an all-powerful and perfectly good God, who directly controls the universe. Regarding everything in the world as of divine origin, he denied the existence of evil, which would imply that the Deity was defective in either goodness or power. Many things which are generally regarded as misfortunes were in his opinion matters of indifference, and so also were many others that are usually termed blessings. Thus Marcus Aurelius, a leading expositor of Stoicism, says: "He that reckons prosperity and pleasure among things really good, pain and hardship among things really evil, can be no pious person, for such a man will be sure to complain of the administration of Providence."¹ This idea, if carried out consistently, in all its bearings upon life, would necessarily tend to make men severe, unsympathetic, and harsh. It made pain a pretense and pity an act of impiety. It crushed and starved emotion.²

Zeno taught his followers to take an active interest in affairs of state; and Stoicism owes much of its historical importance to its acceptance by many distinguished Roman statesmen and authors. To the latter class belong Epictetus and Seneca; and Marcus Aurelius does honor to both classes. But the Stoic should not seek public office. He should accept it when it was offered to him, and not otherwise. Epictetus said: "Remember that in life you ought to behave as at a banquet. Sup-

pose that something is carried round and is opposite to you. Stretch out your hand and take a portion with decency. Suppose that it passes by you. Do not detain it. Suppose that it is not yet come to you. Do not send your desire forward to it, but wait till it is opposite to you. Do so with respect to children, so with respect to a wife, so with respect to magisterial offices, so with respect to wealth, and you will be sometime a worthy partner of the banquets of the gods. But if you take none of the things which are set before you, and even despise them, then will you be not only a fellow-banqueter with the gods, but also a partner with them in power. For by acting thus Diogenes and Heracleitus and those like them, were deservedly divine, and were so called."³

In the doctrine of the Stoics, death is not an evil; it is a matter of indifference. It is not wrong to invite death or to commit suicide. It is far better to die than to violate any duty. Priscus Helvidius was a Stoic, and applied his belief in his life. "For when Vespasian sent and commanded him not to go into the senate, he replied, 'It is in your power not to allow me to be a member of the senate, but so long as I am, I must go in.' 'Well, go in then,' says the emperor, 'but say nothing.' 'Do not ask my opinion, and I will be silent.' 'But I must ask your opinion.' 'And I must say what I think right.' 'But if you do I shall put you to death.' 'When, then, did I tell you that I am immortal? You will do your part and I will do mine; it is your part to kill; it is mine to die, but not in fear; yours to banish me; mine to depart without sorrow.'"⁴

In regard to suicide, the Stoical doctrine is thus expressed by Epictetus: "In sum remember this: the

door is open; be not more timid than little children, but as they say, when the thing does not please them, 'I will play no longer,' so do you, when things seem to you of such a kind, say, I will no longer play, and be gone: but if you stay do not complain."⁵ Many of the leading Stoics, including Zeno himself, and his successor in the headship of the school at Athens, died by their own hands.

Zeno taught his pupils to make liberal allowances for others; and to judge an enemy leniently. Epictetus says: "Recollect that in what he [your enemy] says or does, he follows his own sense of propriety, not yours. He must do what appears to him right, not what appears so to you. If he judges wrongly it is he that is hurt, for he is the person deceived. Always repeat to yourself in such a case, 'The man has acted on his own opinion.' We should never be unhappy because of what others think of us; we should be unhappy if we know we have acted unbecomingly. "Remember that it is not he who reviles you or strikes you, who insults you, but it is your opinion about these things as being insulting. When, then, a man irritates you, you must know that it is your own opinion which has irritated you. Therefore, especially try not to be carried away by the appearance For if you once gain time and delay, you will more easily master yourself."⁶

The first principle of nature, according to Zeno, is self-love; and the highest duty of a man is to keep himself in a state of nature, that is in harmony with nature. He may properly provide first for his own welfare, but must always take thought also for the welfare of others. The Stoic idea of submission to the divine will is thus expressed by Epictetus: "As to piety towards the gods

you must know that this is the chief thing, to have right opinions about them, to think that they exist, and that they administer the all well and justly; and you must fix yourself in this principle [duty], to obey them, and to yield to them in everything which happens, and voluntarily to follow it as being accomplished by the wisest intelligence. For if you do so, you will never either blame the gods, nor will you accuse them of neglecting you. And it is not possible for this to be done in any other way than by withdrawing from the things which are not in our power, and by placing the good and the evil only in those things which are in our power. For if you think that any of the things, which are not in our power, is good or bad, it is absolutely necessary that, when you do not obtain what you wish, and when you fall into those things which you do not wish, you will find fault and hate those who are the cause of them; for every animal is formed by nature to this, to fly from and to turn from the things which appear harmful and the things which are the cause of the harm, but to follow and admire the things which are useful and the causes of the useful. It is impossible then for a person who thinks that he is harmed to be delighted with that which he thinks to be the cause of the harm, as it is also impossible to be pleased with the harm itself.”⁷

Another class of Greek philosophers, few in number and not deserving the name of a school, were the Cynics (dogs), who snarled at everything, neglected the elegances and even the decencies of life, lived like mendicants, and exalted ascetic suppression of the sympathetic and sensuous feelings. The Cynics would probably have attracted little attention if they had not had a very witty representative in Diogenes. “The virtue which is loud, noisy, ostentatious, and self-affirmative looks very

like an obtrusive egoism. And this was the virtue of the Cynics. Pretending to reform mankind, it began by blaspheming humanity; pretending to correct the effeminacies of the age, it studiously outraged all the decencies of life. Eluding the real difficulty of the problem, it pretended to solve it by unabashed insolence.”⁸

SEC. 406. *Greek Science*.—Greek science owed most of its progress to the aid and encouragement granted to it by the sovereigns of Macedon and Egypt. It was by the liberality of Alexander that Aristotle was enabled to collect his information and to write his encyclopedic statement of the scientific knowledge of his time. Among all the dynasties known to history, the Macedonian Ptolemies in Egypt deserve the credit of having been the most generous, the most intelligent, and the most successful royal patrons of science. When Ptolemy I. found himself securely seated on the Egyptian throne, in 306 b. c., one of his first measures was a large grant of money for the establishment of the museum or university of Alexandria, with a library, botanical garden, menagerie, anatomical school, astronomical observatory, and teachers of geography, geometry, mathematics, languages, grammar, engineering, and many other branches of knowledge. The library grew with great rapidity, and soon became famous for possessing the most accurate and most complete editions of many famous authors, as well as having a collection which in its magnitude far excelled any other ever made. It was one of the intellectual wonders of the ancient world. It is the “unique and noble memorial of the dynasty of the Ptolemies, who have thereby laid the whole human race under obligations, and vindicated their title to be regarded as a most

illustrious line of kings.”¹ The age of the Ptolemies—for there were five intelligent patrons of learning in this wonderful dynasty—produced no great poet, historian, or orator, but it fostered a long succession of distinguished men of science. In the time of Julius Cæsar, after having existed two centuries and a half, the museum was destroyed by a conflagration, and though afterwards partially replaced, never approached its former position. Poets were patronized, and poetry and philosophy were taught; but most of the patronage was given to the scientific department, which was early recognized as the characteristic feature and chief boast of Alexandrian literature.

The first teacher of great eminence at the museum was Euclid, whose treatise on geometrical problems is still the text-book wherever geometry is studied. No other school book has ever held dominion for so long a period, and so wide an area, with so little change. He presumably copied many of his demonstrations from his predecessors; but he added to them many new ones of his own, and he gave to them a form which has not been materially improved since. His successor, Apollonius Pergæus, wrote on conic sections, and added much to the previous knowledge of mathematics. Archimedes, a little later, though a native and resident of Syracuse, belonged to the Alexandrian school of mathematicians and students of physical science. He ascertained the proportion of the radius to the circumference of a circle, and also that of the contents of a solid sphere to its circumscribing cylinder. He originated the idea of specific gravity, and discovered the method of determining the relation of weight to bulk. He was the first to explain the true theory of the lever. He invented many ingen-

ious machines, such as the screw pump, the hydraulic organ, and various engines used for military purposes. Hipparchus, whose most active years were in the last half of the IIInd century B. C., made material additions to trigonometry and other branches of mathematics. In astronomy he made the important discovery of the precession of the equinoxes, catalogued more than a thousand stars, and suggested a theory to explain the apparent movements of the planets in consistency with the theory of their revolution in circular orbits. He also invented the astrolabe for measuring angles and determining the height of the stars and planets. Aristarchus calculated the distance of the sun to be eighteen times greater than that of the moon; and although he made a great error, for the relation should be four hundred instead of eighteen, his method was instructive. Eratosthenes, who became the chief librarian, made several interesting additions to mathematical and geographical science, including an approximate determination of the space between the tropics, and the discovery that vertical lines converge downwards. He measured the distance from Alexandria to Syene, and then, from the latitudes of the two places, calculated the diameter of the earth to be about 30,000 miles. For his time this was a marvelous achievement.

In the IIInd century A. D., Ptolemy, the geographer, not a descendant of the royal dynasty of the same name, was the last eminent Greek in the school of Alexandria. His chief work was a comprehensive treatise on astronomy. He accepted the geocentric theory, and attempted to explain the movements of the heavenly bodies in such a manner as to make them harmonize with the idea that these bodies revolved around the earth. Although his

book taught a fundamental error, it contained a vast amount of correct knowledge and suggestive remark; and for more than a thousand years it remained the chief work of astronomy. Among other points of original information, it recorded the observation of the inequality in the motion of the moon, discovered by its author.

The scientific discoveries of the Greeks at Alexandria were a wonderful series of contributions to human knowledge. For several centuries the average number of students at the Museum was more than three thousand, and at one time rose to 14,000. In philosophy, in poetry, and in oratory, it was far inferior to the Athens of its time, but in mathematics, astronomy, geography, dynamics, and surgery, it took the lead, and with the decline of its school, those sciences fell into decay among the Aryan peoples.

SEC. 407. *Greek Medicine, etc.*—As compared with the enlightened nations of our century, the ancient Greeks did not reach a high degree of therapeutical skill. They had no knowledge of chemistry. Their ideas of anatomy and physiology were superficial. They had neither thermometer, microscope nor accurate scales to assist them in diagnosis. They were not in the habit of dissecting the human body until after the time of Alexander. Many of the most potent remedies of modern medicine were unknown to them. They had neither morphine, quinine, calomel, nor alcohol; and previous to the middle of the Vth century B. C., the physicians kept their professional knowledge as a secret, reserved for favored pupils.

Among the common remedies were purges, emetics, enemas, blood-letting by lancet and cupping, cold baths, and fasting. When drugs were administered, they were

usually prepared by the physicians; but if to be bought at shops, the prescriptions were written in a dialect or in signs not familiar to the multitude. The physicians of ancient, like those of modern, times disliked to let their patients know the precise quality and quantity of their remedies. Proprietary medicines were not unknown.

There were medical schools at the cities of Rhodes, Cnidos, and Cos, and also at several temples to *Æsculapius*, the god of medicine, situated at sanitariums, either in places where the air was considered very wholesome, or near medicinal springs. As to the subjects of study, the mode of instruction, or the rules for the admission or examination of students, we have no definite information. In many cases, the profession of physician was hereditary in families, of which the most noted was that known as the Asclepiads, or descendants of *Æsculapius*.

As in other nations of antiquity, so also among the Greeks, the belief that all diseases were inflicted on man by divine or demoniac agency was a great obstacle to the rise and development of medical science; but among them first, a considerable proportion of the people outgrew that old superstition, and among them too the art of healing reached an excellence unknown among their contemporaries.

Before the time of Hippocrates, philosophers had begun to ascribe natural phenomena to natural causes, but so far as we know, he was the first physician to deny the theory that disease was due to supernatural powers. Epilepsy was considered, as more manifestly than any other malady, a demoniac possession, and for that reason, among the Greeks, was called the "sacred disease." Of this Hippocrates wrote: "The disease is nowise more divine than others; but has its nature such as other dis-

eases have, and a cause whence it originates, and its cause and nature are divine only just as much as all others are; and it is curable no less than others, unless when from length of time, it is confirmed and has become stronger than the remedies applied."

Surgery made more progress than medicine, mainly because the result of the treatment could be observed more accurately. Armies were accompanied by surgeons who had their ointments and bandages, and for severed arteries, they used red-hot iron or boiling pitch.

Hippocrates was more eminent in surgery than in medicine. His treatises on articulations, dislocations, and fractures are still valuable, and in some points are unsurpassed. In reference to his essay on articulations, Adams, who translated him into English, says: "Several sections of the work are perfect masterpieces, such for example as the parts which relate to dislocations at the shoulder and hip-joint, and more especially the latter, in which, as it appears to me, he has given a fuller and more complete history of everything relating to the subject than is to be found in any single work even at the present day."

The dissection of the human body was first practised systematically at Alexandria, and there anatomy made great progress. It was perhaps here that was discovered the ligature of the artery which was mentioned by Celsus, but was apparently not practiced extensively; for it was soon afterwards lost to the art of surgery, and remained unknown to surgeons generally for more than a thousand years. The anatomical text-book of Galen is a work of great learning, and in its form, as well as its information, bears a close resemblance to modern works written for the same purpose.

SEC. 408. *Greek Music*.—Music received more attention among the Greeks than in any other nation of antiquity, and it seems to have exerted a greater influence on them; but whether they were superior either in composition or in execution to the Egyptians, Babylonians, Phœnicians, or Lydians, is a question upon which we have no conclusive evidence. Their authors do not make a distinct claim of superiority, nor of any important addition either to the science of music or to the instruments used in it, but they write as if the moral tone of their serious airs was better than that of the barbarians.

Much that they say upon this point, however, is not clearly comprehensible. We can understand how an air suggests the patriotic, ludicrous, or sentimental idea to which it has been attached; or how martial, merry, or sad thoughts are brought before the mind by certain combinations of notes, but we cannot understand how a nation could be demoralized in its military discipline and in its political management by the influence of pernicious music. Yet leading thinkers, including Plato and Aristotle, considered immoral music to be one of the greatest evils in a state. Felton says: “The moral degeneracy which marked the later periods of Greek history was traced, by philosophers and satirists alike, to the corruption which had glided into the heart through the melting tones of a luxuriant and overrefined music.”¹

The Greeks divided musical airs into four main classes or moods, the serious Dorian, the wailing Lydian, the convivial Ionian and the Phrygian. Mahaffy thinks the Lydian was in the major key, while the Dorian and Phrygian were in the minor. The main difference ac-

cording to him was in the “arrangement or progression of the notes.”²

It is worthy of remark that some authors on China, where, to European taste, the music is of a most barbarous and ludicrous character, speak of the moral influence of music in terms very similar to those used in ancient Greece. Mahaffy suggests that the Phrygian music may have been similar in the arrangement of its notes to the Czardas, a national air of the Magyars, and he adds: “It is probable that the far greater complexity of our music, the multiplication of instruments, the development of harmony, has brought out intellectual instincts unknown to them [the ancient Greeks], and so obscured the moral questions once so striking.”³

The musical instruments of the Greeks were the lyre, lute, harp, fife, flute, flageolet, Pan’s pipe, trumpet, horn, drum, cymbal, and castanets. The seven-stringed lyre was the most common because it was lighter than the harp, and because, unlike the flute, pipe, and horn, it allowed the performer to sing an accompaniment; and the song had a greater place relatively in music then than in modern times. The violin, keyed horns, piano, and all instruments of their classes now so prominent, were as yet unknown. There was no harmony in the higher sense of the word; and if there was any method of writing musical notes, it was very rude and vague. There was, however, a large stock of well known musical airs, which have been lost or are no longer traceable to an ancient origin.

SEC. 409. *Greek Architecture, etc.*—The oldest remains of Greek architecture are cyclopean walls of immense stones, irregular in shape, laid up without mortar; and false arches and vaults, made by bringing horizontal

courses of stones gradually nearer to one another. These structures do not differ notably from similar structures of the early barbarous nations of western Asia. But in the VIIth century b. c., and perhaps earlier, the Greeks began to show in their architecture that remarkable perception and taste for proportion which were among their most striking characteristics. Whether they obtained their general plans of temples from Egypt or Asia, has been a question of dispute among scholars, but that they made a vast improvement upon their model is admitted by all. They rejected as much as they accepted, and made everything their own, by modifying forms and proportions, so that every part should be simple, and in harmony with every other part. The columns were made higher in proportion to thickness; the spaces between them were enlarged; excessive ornamentation was discarded; and among the results were three styles of architecture, the Dorian, Ionic, and Corinthian, each considered as perfect in its kind, and admirably suited to the purposes for which it was designed.

The most splendid edifices of the Greeks were temples and theatres, and each of these classes had one general plan from which there was little variation, save in the size. The Propylaea in Athens, and the Initiation Hall in Eleusis, were notable structures without their parallels elsewhere. There was no great palace, legislative hall, city hall, gallery of art, college building, hospital, amphitheatre, dome, arch, or bridge in all Greece. The Greeks took lessons in building and statuary from the older nations, especially those of Egypt and Babylonia, but they improved so much upon the work of their masters, that they seem to deserve all the credit of having developed architecture as a fine art out of masonry, and

sculpture out of stonecutting. Felton says : "Whatever else the Greeks may have borrowed from the land of the Pharaohs, beauty they did not borrow. . . . They made whatever they received their own, by working it over again. They breathed into rude materials and ungainly forms the elegance and grace of their own brilliant spirits. They turned inanimate matter into the almost breathing forms of art. They raised death into life, and stamped upon life the seal of immortality."¹

In many respects the sculpture of the Greeks is vastly superior to that of any earlier nation, and has not been surpassed in later times. In the correctness of their proportions of the human figure, in the truth of their anatomy in repose and action, in the beauty, grace, and dignity of their forms, in the rich artistic suggestiveness of their subjects, whether of single individuals or groups, in the sentiment and passion in many faces, and in the felicitous handling of their materials whether in the round or in low or high relief, whether in marble or in bronze, their broken fragments are the subjects of inexhaustible admiration to the greatest modern critics.

As an ornamental art, painting had its origin among the Greeks. They were the first to use the brush, to model with light and shade, to use aerial and linear perspective, and to paint good portraits, landscapes, still life, and theatrical scenery. Before their time, the only painting was a uniform wash applied with a sponge, and variegated perhaps with a stencil plate.

CHAPTER XXVI.

GREEK INDUSTRY.

SECTION 410. *Greek Homes*.—Far superior as the Greeks of the Vth century b. c. were to all other nations in their literature, ornamental art, polity, and military discipline, they could claim no notable superiority in mining, metallurgy, masonry, woodwork, shipbuilding, navigation, weaving, dyeing, tillage, or the breeding of animals. In navigation and dyeing they admitted that the Phoenicians were more skillful.

Although idleness was considered a vice in Athens, and although the law encouraged and public opinion of that city permitted leading citizens to engage in industrial pursuits, there was, nevertheless, a considerable social prejudice against the ruder forms of manual labor and the smaller branches of shopkeeping. Those shopkeepers who had booths in the market-place, were generally despised at Athens; and at Thebes they were disfranchised for a period of ten years.

Throughout Greece, most of the work was done by slaves, except in a small mountainous district north of the Corinthian Gulf, where all the people were free, and nearly all were poor. Generally a state had at least three slaves for one freeman; in many cases more. Most of the bondmen were held by families to which their ancestors had belonged for generations, and this hereditary relation was accompanied by kindness on one side and

attachment on the other. In many respects the slave fared as well as the poor freeman.

Among the common handicrafts were those of carpenter, mason, brickmaker, stonemason, smith, cabinet-maker, wheelwright, turner, weaver, dyer, tanner, shoemaker, potter, baker, cook, and glass blower. Mechanical work was usually done in a small shop, with a small supply of tools. Large factories requiring multitudes of workmen and large stocks of material existed, but were very rare.

Until after their absorption by Rome, the Greeks had little that we call machinery for ordinary use in their mechanical or agricultural labor. They had no large power-producing wheel, driven by water, wind, or the tread of animals; nor had they a revolving axle with teeth to thresh or with fans to winnow grain. Grain was usually ground by hand, rarely in mills turned by quadrupeds.

Except in connection with military operations, extensive engineering enterprises were rare among the Greeks. A lake in Boeotia was drained and water was brought into Samos by a tunnel; and the harbors of Athens and Samos had breakwaters, as a protection to shipping.

The home of a wealthy family in a city was inclosed by a high wall, which had only one opening, the main door. There was no outer window; no side or rear door leading into the street. The rooms were arranged round two courts, that nearest the street door, with its apartments, being used by the men and the boys over seven years of age; and the rear court and its apartments were reserved for the women, girls, and little boys. The two courts were connected by a door which was under the charge of the wife or feminine head of the household.

The courts were surrounded by verandas or colonnades which gave protection against rain and sun. The rear of the inner courts had rooms for looms and household stores. The apartments around the courts were small, and those intended for bedrooms had no opening save a door, which was closed by a curtain. Windows were few, small, and unglazed. Blocks on busy streets had much of their frontage occupied by shops, but these usually had no communication with the courts. On streets that had little traffic, a portion of the frontage was often occupied by stables; staircases leading to upper stories were sometimes built inside and sometimes outside of the rooms. The houses of the poor were mostly of adobe; those of the rich of brick or stone. Floors were of stone, tile, or clay.

Among the articles of kitchen furniture were a sink, kneading trough, pots, pans, chopping block, cleaver, mortar, spits, andirons, ovens, sieves, chafing dishes, and roasters for barley and beans. There were also platters, bowls, and ladles made out of fig wood. Over the hearth there was sometimes an opening for the escape of the smoke, but nothing that we would call a chimney. When rooms were to be heated, braziers were used; and the poor carried little chafing dishes or put them between their feet. Wood, charcoal, and, rarely, mineral coal were used as fuel.

In their household utensils the Greeks exhibited signs of that delicate taste which enabled them to carry the plastic arts to an excellence unapproached in any other ancient nation. Many of their vases, pitchers, urns, cups, lamps, and tables were made in patterns that have never been surpassed in elegance. In metal and in pottery they acquired an admirable skill. They were the first to

appreciate the value of soft terra cotta as distinct from hard pottery for ornamental purposes, and they used it extensively. They painted terra cotta vases in distemper before burning, and they baked it with or without glaze, some of their glaze being of a kind that did not make a vessel water-tight. They used terra cotta and plaster moulds for making casts of statuary.

The cities were built densely with narrow streets, and houses closely crowded together so that the inclosing wall should be short in proportion to the men who were to be its defenders in case of war. And the probability of war was always a prominent consideration in selecting the site, and adopting a plan for a city. A hill top was preferred, especially a rocky hill with steep sides. The large blocks of stone with which streets were paved in leading cities, were not put down for trotting horses or light wagons.

The popular interest in the chariot races at the Olympian, Pythian, and Nemean games was so great that every Greek city had its cart road open to the places where those games were held; but these roads, as well as all others outside of the cities, were muddy in wet, and dusty in dry weather; in some places steep, in others swampy.

Every city had its market-place, where provisions and merchandise of many kinds were offered for sale daily, or on certain frequently recurring market days, and where cooks, messengers, nurses, dancers, jugglers, and artisans collected for hire. The opening of the fish market was announced by ringing a bell. At all the national and international festivals, buyers and sellers met in grounds set apart for their use. Industrial exhibitions were held, but we know little about their system or results.

SEC. 411. Greek Agriculture.—Barley was the staff of life throughout Greece, and was eaten in porridge and in cakes, often baked without leaven and sometimes eaten without baking. Wheat, millet, rye, and spelt were used in the same manner. Among the common vegetables, were onions, garlic, beans, peas, turnips, radishes, lettuce and asparagus. Pickled olives had a prominent place on the table; and olive oil was used extensively in cooking. Figs, grapes, chestnuts, walnuts, almonds, apples, pears, quinces, cherries, and plums, were cultivated. The meat of domestic animals, sold in the markets, was mostly that obtained from the temples where it had been offered to the gods in sacrifice. Honey, and pastry sweetened with honey, were common. There was no sugar. Wine mixed with an equal, double, or treble share of water was the common beverage. Mead was used, and beer was not unknown. There were neither hot nor frozen drinks, but snow was sometimes brought from the mountains to cool the wine.

Swampy land was drained, and dry land was irrigated from streams or wells. Stable manure was saved. The soil was prepared for planting with the plough on some farms, and on others with the hoe or spade. Barley was cultivated more extensively than any other cereal, mainly because it thrives better in a dry climate and light soil. Most of the transportation was done on the backs of slaves or horses, or on carts drawn by oxen or horses. Pack horses were used with armies. Travelers by land, even distinguished ambassadors, usually went on foot.

The horse and the cow were relatively rare. The former owes much of his value in modern life to the iron shoe, the stirrup, the light wagon, good harness, and good roads and pavements, all of which were wanting in

ancient Greece. Cows were too costly to be used in sacrifice by any save the wealthy. The sheep was preferred for the altars, and mutton was more abundant than beef. Most of the milk was furnished by the goat, which was better suited than the cow to the steep and brush-covered hills. Butter was rare and cheese abundant. The management of the dairy received much attention, and slaves, skillful in making cheese, commanded good prices. Chickens, geese, ducks, pigeons, guinea hens, quails, partridges, pheasants, and thrushes were among the domestic fowls.

The earliest known mention of grafting and budding is in Greek books, which, however, do not tell us in what country or century those processes had their origin. The vine was pruned with care, but was not cultivated in a manner that would be considered creditable to modern skill. Instead of trimming them low, and leaving them without support—a method that does well with the vine of Europe—the Greek grape grower usually trained his vines upon trees which took a considerable part of the nutriment of the soil. This wasteful system prevails to our own times in many districts of southern Europe, but finds no favor among the more intelligent vineyardists. There is nothing in the books to indicate the varieties of grape cultivated; nor do we know whether they had different varieties for the table, for wine, and for drying. The Chian wine was considered the best in the Athenian market, but we have no information whether its superior excellence was due to the influence of soil, of climate, of skill in the cellar masters, or of the variety of grape; or of several or all of these in combination.

Every wealthy man, whether he dwelt in the city or

not, owned a farm, which was expected to yield all the grain, kitchen vegetables, fruit, oil, pickled olives, wine, cider, meat, wool, and flax needed in his family. The flax and wool were spun, woven, and dyed in the house, most of the work being done by slaves.

No well defined rules for improving the breed of domestic animals have been preserved to us from ancient Greece; nor do we read that different varieties of sheep were bred for long and short wool, and for moist and for dry pasture; nor that different varieties of cows were bred for butter, for cheese, and for beef; nor that different varieties of horses were prized for heavy draft, and for trotting. Our ignorance on these points, however, may be chargeable mainly to the loss of Greek books on agriculture, rather than to the lack of such things in Hellenic communities. We know that they attached much value to certain breeds of domestic animals; and that a sheep which would bring only twenty cents for slaughter, might command \$1,000 for breeding purposes. An equally high price was paid for the best pigs. The most valuable horses were those designed for use in racing at the national and Panhellenic games.

SEC. 412. *Greek Commerce.*—The money was gold, silver, and copper or bronze coin, that struck by Athens after the time of Solon being considered the best in Greece, because of the uniformity of its quality, and the excellence of the mintage. Gold was to silver nearly as one to ten, and to copper as one to three thousand. Money was counted by the gold talent of about \$10,000; the silver talent of about \$1,000; the mina of \$18; the dram of eighteen cents; and the obol of three cents. In ordinary times a sheep was worth about twenty cents; an ox, eighty; the day's work of an unskilled laborer,

twelve; and barley enough to feed a man for a day, a cent and a half. The money of the poor was copper; and gold was rare. A healthy male slave, in his active years, was worth from \$20 to \$40. A man possessing \$10,000 in Athens was rich; and Critias, the richest citizen in Athenian history, with \$200,000, had a position similar to that which an American now holds with \$100,000,000.

There were no banks or bills of exchange, but there were money brokers who dealt in foreign coin and lent money on interest for themselves and for others. The lowest rate of annual interest was ten per cent, the highest forty, and the average fifteen or twenty. Money lending was not disreputable, nor was there any legal limit to the percentage. Athenian law did not enforce the collection of a loan on the mortgage of a ship going to a foreign port, unless the contract provided that a return cargo must be brought to Athens; and when money was lent under such a contract, the lender frequently sent an agent or supercargo to collect the debt at the foreign port.

Among the Greeks, mariners, marine fishermen, and shipwrights were numerous. Nearly every Hellenic city was near the sea; every leading Greek state had some seaport in its territory. Harbors, roadsteads, islands, and promontories were relatively near together, so that the prudent shipmaster, on the watch for storms, was seldom far from some place where he could find shelter. The ordinary size of the Greek ship was ten or twenty tons, and its form was long, with seats for numerous rowers, who could drag it along on the land. The main reliance for propulsion was on oars, but there was a mast, with a sail to be used when the wind was favorable.

Rigging, for conveniently shifting the position of the sail to any angle required, had not been devised, and mariners had not learned to sail against the wind, or, at least, not so close to the wind as they do now.

Long voyages for commercial purposes were limited to the eight months of fair weather, from April to November inclusive; and during the other four months, the ships lay at anchor, or more commonly were drawn up on the beach out of reach of the waves. In trading ships the breadth was usually one fourth, in war ships one eighth or one tenth of the length. In some cases lead was used for sheathing; copper never. Anchors, capstans, and hemp cables, much like those of modern times, were in use. The art of navigation consisted largely in control over the rowmen, and in familiarity with the appearance of the numerous headlands which became visible successively in the customary voyages, which, except on rare occasions, were made within sight of land. A pilot who felt safe when he had been beyond the range of any landmark for more than twenty-four hours, was considered extremely bold. The shipmaster bound from the southwestern point of the Peloponnesus, a distance of three hundred and fifty miles, in a due west direction across the open sea, preferred the longer route, going three hundred miles in a northwest direction to Corfu, and then at right angles, southwestward an equal distance to his destination, pursuing the longer route for the sake of keeping within sight of visible guiding points on the solid ground.

CHAPTER XXVII.

GREEK SOCIETY.

SECTION 413. *Greek Women*.—The main differences between the social life of ancient Greece and that of modern Europe have been caused by industrial improvements, such as the chimney, window glass, lamp chimney, illuminating gas, the clock and watch, the printing press, and the steam engine. The ancient Greek, having no chimney, could not make his house warm in cold weather, without filling it with smoke. His usual artificial light in the house was furnished by a saucer-shaped lamp, in which the wick lay in the oil, furnishing a dim and smoky flame. For ordinary purposes, the day ended when darkness set in, and the people generally went to bed soon after twilight, and rose with the dawn. No political assembly, no theatrical or musical entertainment, no lecture, no shop or factory, was open after dark. By making it possible to admit light without cold, wind, or rain, window glass changed the plans of public and private buildings. The clock gave a precision and regularity that were previously lacking. The Greeks could measure time by the running of water or of sand, but the clepsydras and hour-glasses were so defective that very few persons used them. Cheap mechanical power, cheap literature, cheap and rapid transportation of merchandise, the almost in-

stantaneous transmission of information, the establishment of a postal system, and the abolition of slavery have contributed much to give to modern life a variety, a fullness, and a comfort unknown to the ancient Greeks.

In historic Greece woman's social position differed greatly from that held by her sex in any other country. The respectable girl was bred in seclusion. Though, in the wealthy families, she often learned to read, she could not leave the house to take lessons, nor did she have a teacher unless it was her mother or a female slave of the family. For her there was no instruction in music, painting, elocution, rhetoric, or dancing. She never went promenading in the street nor shopping; she never attended a mixed party of ladies and gentlemen at dinner, picnic, or ball; she never rode on horseback nor drove out in a carriage for pleasure. It was not proper for her to engage in conversation with a gentleman unless he was a near relative. In the selection of her husband her wishes were not consulted. Absolute submission to her father's choice was demanded by public opinion. An orphan heiress was under legal obligation to marry her nearest male relative, excepting only father, grandfather, full brother, and half brother by the same mother.

The seclusion of the wife was almost as complete as that of the maiden. Unless she was poor, the occasions were rare when she could properly leave her house. She took care of her boys till they were seven years old; she trained her daughters in household affairs, and perhaps taught them to read; she managed the household slaves; she took charge of the clothing, food, and other household supplies; and, with the help of her slaves, she spun all the thread and wove all the cloth needed in the family. She waited at table upon her husband and her

sons who had passed their seventh year, and when they had finished their meal, she and her daughters could eat by themselves; and after they had finished, the slaves were allowed to eat. The married woman might call on a lady friend in the daytime, with a woman slave for her companion on the street, but she must not leave her home often. If some urgent necessity, such as the serious illness of a near relative, required her to leave her dwelling at night, she must be accompanied by slaves with torches.

Whether the respectable woman could go to the theater to witness the performance of tragedies in Athens is a matter of dispute among scholars. There was a place for women, but whether they were the wives of reputable and influential citizens is not clear. The comedy was certainly prohibited to them. They could take part, however, in processions at certain ecclesiastical festivals.

The woman was not considered a suitable intellectual companion for her husband. He could have only one legal wife in Greece, and matrimony had a religious consecration. He could not marry an alien woman nor a slave, he must ally himself with the daughter of a citizen if he wished his marriage to have that sacredness which would entitle his sons to be citizens. But the religious character of wedlock, as he understood it, did not elevate his wife to social equality with him. Even if they two were alone in the house together, he was not to eat with her, nor to make a practice of conversing with her, nor to walk with her arm in arm or side by side, nor to seek to educate her so that she should be the preferred companion in the hours that he could give to social relaxation.

Her legal rights were few. She might own property

inherited from her parents or given to her by her relatives, but its control and the use of its income belonged to her husband. She did not even own herself when she became a widow. By his will her husband could designate her next husband, and her refusal to submit to such a bequest subjected her to the loss of all her property.

Notwithstanding the inferiority of their legal rights, many Athenian wives were presumably happy in their domestic sphere. Themistocles, it is said, pointed out to a stranger, a child as the ruler of Athens. When asked for an explanation, he said the child ruled its mother, and she ruled her husband, who was Themistocles, then the most influential man in the city. But beyond some such vague suggestions of the domestic authority of Athenian wives, we read little of them as individuals. Not one has a prominent place in history; not one is famous for learning, talent, or heroic conduct. No woman born in Attica has a fame like that of the mother of the Gracchi, or like that of the wife of Brutus. Sappho was a great poet and Aspasia an eminent critic, but they were not natives of Athens.

In Sparta the education and social position of women were peculiar. The girls were trained in gymnastic exercises. Dressed only in short chemise or chiton, partly open on one side so as to show the hip, the girl was required to race, jump, and wrestle, under the superintendence and within the view of men and boys; and she was permitted to see the Olympic contests of naked men, though matrons, whether of Spartan or any other nationality, were excluded under penalty of death. Partly because of their athletic training, and partly because the state took care that every weakly and

deformed child, and probably every child of sickly or puny parents, should die in infancy, the Spartans, both men and women, were noted throughout Greece for their beauty, activity, strength, endurance, and height. Spartan women were called bull-stranglers, because it was said that each was strong enough to strangle a bull. They were considered superior as nurses to the women of any other part of Greece. While they were generally ignorant of letters and lacking in refinement, they had strong character and much self-respect. In discretion of conduct, and modesty of demeanor, they were not inferior to the women of other Greek states; and they were credited with more influence in state as well as more authority in their households. An Athenian woman said to a Spartan woman, "You are the only women who know how to govern the men;" and the proud reply was, "Yes, and we are the only women who give birth to men."

As the young men and maidens had more opportunities of seeing each other, so there was more love-making among them in Sparta than elsewhere. The Spartan was not allowed to keep house until he was thirty years of age; and if he married earlier, he must visit his wife by stealth. But there was no elopement. The father or guardian of the bride gave his consent; and when the lover met her, it might be when she was in a chorus, in the gymnasium, or in the street, he seized her violently and carried her off to a bridesmaid, who cut off her hair as a symbol of her condition as a wife. The husband returned to his companions as if nothing had happened, but when night came he sneaked into the bridal chamber. Such stolen interviews might continue for months before he introduced her to his own home and his relatives.

Among citizens wedlock had a religious character, and the marriage ceremony was sometimes performed in a temple. The bride who had been brought up to adore the domestic gods, the divine ancestors of her father's family, was formally released from that worship at his domestic hearth; she ate with the groom, in the presence of witnesses, as a sign that she accepted him as her husband; she went with an escort to his house, where she was presented to her husband's domestic gods and transferred to their allegiance by being carried several times around their sacred fire. Thus she was introduced to the religion of her husband and transferred to his dominion. If she went to a man without the religious ceremony, she did not become his wife, under the customs and law of Greece.

Divorce was rare, but could be obtained easily when both parties desired it, and without much difficulty when the husband insisted, even if the wife objected. The law provided that a man should have the privilege of getting rid of a wife if he had an opportunity to espouse a rich woman to whom he was the nearest male relative within the marriageable degrees. If able to do so, the father of a bride gave her a dowry; and the money to be obtained was usually an important part of the bargain, and a subject of explicit stipulation. In case of a divorce, the husband was required to restore the amount of the dowry to the father or guardian of the wife.

Neither law nor public opinion required the husband to be faithful to his wife or to make any pretense of fidelity. Without discredit he could openly and habitually associate with *hetairæ*, women of light reputation, as did the most distinguished statesmen, authors, and artists,

including men like Themistocles, Pericles, Demosthenes, Socrates, Plato, Epicurus, Phidias, Praxiteles, and Apelles, some of whom share their immortality with their *hetairæ* friends, while their wives are relatively obscure. If a rich Greek wanted the company of an intellectual woman he did not look for it to his wife.

The Greek *hetairæ* were a class which has not its like in any other country, and they owed their prominence partly to the seclusion and ignorance of the wives. Many of them were highly educated and accomplished; and by their education, accomplishments, and association with intellectual men, acquired a distinguished social tact and a conversational brilliancy. They studied and they sometimes taught rhetoric, elocution, music, and general literature. Eminent men, and in a few instances reputable matrons, sought their instruction. They practiced dancing, but this was only to acquire grace of movement, or to entertain a single male friend or at the most two or three friends at a dinner. Dancing at large parties or before strangers was beneath the dignity of their profession.

Besides the *hetairæ* there was a less reputable and uneducated class of public women, some of whom were free and others slaves. Among the latter were the women owned by the temples of Aphrodite, of whom there were relatively few at Athens, but many at Corinth, at Cythera, and in Cyprus. Most of them were bought as infants or small girls, and educated for the lives they were to lead.

SEC. 414. *Greek Children*.—If the father lifted up a new-born child it was to live; otherwise to die before receiving nourishment. Public opinion condemned the rearing of a large number of children, and especially of

girls, in poor families. Without a dowry the daughter of a citizen had little chance of obtaining a husband, and old maids were a disgrace to their parents. A considerable proportion of the men were slain in war, and for these, as well as for those who by their spendthrift disposition, or by other mental peculiarities, were incompetent to maintain families creditably, calculation was made in the practice of infanticide. That mode of equalizing the sexes was favored by Plato; and Aristotle advised intentional abortion to limit the number of children. These practices, now abhorred by public opinion in all civilized countries, were directly commended by "the two greatest authorities in the Hellenic world; men differing on many points from each other but agreeing in this; men not only of lofty personal character, but also of first-rate intellectual force, in whom the ideas of virtue and vice had been as much developed by reflection as they ever have been in any mind."¹ Before the establishment of Christianity no Greek moralist and no Greek state condemned either of these practices. It was considered more merciful to the child to let it die at once than to bring it up for a life of abject poverty.

Infants were seldom slain, but many were exposed or left in some solitary place, so that they might die for lack of nourishment. In or near the cities there were places recognized by custom, as proper for such exposure. Any person finding such an infant might take it, and rear it as a slave. It was from such foundling girls that many of the slave women were reared.

Little children had rattles, dolls, hoops, balls, swings and hobby-horses. The girls remained in the woman's part of the house, with the mother, until marriage; and the boy stayed there until he was seven years old.

Then he was transferred to the man's side, and intrusted to a slave, who was to accompany him whenever he left the house, and to be his attendant and body servant through life.

In his eighth year, the Athenian boy was taken from his nurse and sent to school, where he studied spelling, reading, writing, vocal music, recitation of poems, arithmetic, and grammar, of which last branch of education, however, only the rudiments were then understood. In writing numbers, the Greeks represented them by letters, which, for arithmetical purposes, are far inferior to the Hindoo numerals; and calculations were habitually made on the abacus or counting board, which had a place in the Greek school similar to that of the slate in a modern school. The schools opened early in the morning, and in many cases closed at midday, so that the boys could spend the afternoon in play or gymnastic exercises. One of Solon's laws provided that the schools should not begin before sunrise, nor close after sunset. Except in Sparta, there were no state schools in Greece; and as a general rule there was no instruction save for the sons of citizens who had a share in the government. Slaves, and commoners without votes, were allowed to grow up without a knowledge of letters. Girls did not go to schools, but might have lessons at home.

At thirteen, instrumental music was added to the list of studies, the lyre being the favorite instrument, because it was conveniently portable and suitable for accompaniment by the voice. The harp was less in favor, because it was heavy, and the flute and pipes, because the performer could not use his voice.

SEC. 415. *Greek Meals, etc.*—The Greeks were a frugal people. Meat was rarely seen on the tables of the slaves

or poor freemen. The common dinner consisted of bread or porridge, wine, and pickled olives; those were considered necessary for the principal meal. He was fortunate who, in addition, could get cheese, dried figs, and salt. In the cities only the rich could often have fresh meat and fresh fruit. Bread and wine were considered sufficient for the two lighter meals, even in the houses of the wealthy.

The kitchens were small and had few cooking utensils, and those few of pottery. Metallic pots and pans were found only in the houses of the wealthy. Meats were usually stewed or broiled. Ordinarily the cooking was done by the household slaves; but on special occasions of importance, in cities, professional cooks, who had their stands in the market-places, were hired to prepare the meal and to wait on the guests or direct the household slaves in their attendance.

The men ate by themselves, and the women and children afterwards, when the family was alone as well as when it had company. Respectable ladies never went out to dinner with their husbands, and when a man had guests at dinner, his wife did not make her appearance. When guests were invited to dinner in the house of a wealthy man, before they sat down their shoes or sandals were taken off by slaves. There were four main courses for the meal, the first of salad, oysters, sweetmeats, or pungent herbs, or perhaps of several of them; the second of fish, shrimp, lobster, or crab; the third of meat with vegetables; and the fourth of cheese, fruit, and confectionery. There was neither knife nor fork and usually there was no spoon for the separate use of a person at his meals. He was expected to pick up pieces of meat, as well as of vegetable, with his fingers. At grand

dinner parties, girls entertained the party between the courses, with dancing and music. There was a napkin for every guest, and at the end of a course, in which the fingers became greasy, a slave carried to every guest a bowl of water and a towel. The left hand was considered unclean and was not used for lifting food to the mouth.

Reception rooms had benches or sofas, which, in the houses of the rich, were covered with rugs or cushions and, very rarely, with skins. Chairs were less common and more clumsy in pattern than in modern times. The most elegant pieces of furniture were the table and the couch upon which, in historical Greece, the men reclined while dining, resting upon their left elbows. As the bedrooms were small and the clothing plain in cut and material, the bedroom furniture was usually simple.

Barber shops were common, and were places where news was collected and distributed. It was from a barber that the citizens of Athens first heard of the destruction of their army and fleet at Syracuse, and when he could not find his informant he got into serious trouble, on a charge of inventing a false report injurious to the public welfare. The barbers cut, dyed, and bleached hair and beard, and about the time of Alexander the Great began to shave. In earlier times smooth faces were unfashionable.

The clothing was simple, without change in fashion from generation to generation, and was nearly the same for both sexes. There were two principal garments, the chiton or chemise, and himation or mantle. The former, worn next to the body, was a plain sack open at both ends. For the women it reached to the feet; for the men, to the knee or mid-thigh. Sometimes it had sepa-

rate openings for the head and arms, sometimes it was fastened over the shoulders by buckles or strings. Sleeves attached to it were rare; and a girdle might confine it at the waist. In warm weather people, either in the house or at work, usually wore no garment save the chiton. The mantle was large enough to reach to the feet and was necessary for full dress, except for ladies, who, instead of it, might wear a peplum, an outer garment reaching to the hips and similar in cut to the chiton. A small mantle called the chlamys was worn by boys and by cavalry soldiers.

No garment was sewed or knitted to fit the body, arms, or legs tightly. In the ordinary dress of men and women there were no collars, bands, pleats, ruffles, tucks, frills, laces, ornamental edgings, or buttonholes; corsets were unknown, though some matrons wore bands under the breast. The patterns of different colors produced in the loom had stripes in one direction or in two—the latter plaids—and were rare. No cloth was woven with raised figures or irregular colored patterns. The clothing was nearly all home-made, coarse, heavy, durable, uniform and dull in color, and rarely washed. Silks were obtained from China, but were rare and very costly.

Women had no head covering, and men wore none except in military service, in rainy weather, or when traveling. It was the custom of all classes to go barefooted in the house, of slaves to be barefooted at all times, and of adult male citizens to wear sandals when away from home. Slippers and shoes were rare.

Umbrellas and parasols were known. Fashion required the citizen to carry a cane as a symbol of his free condition—a survival presumably of the spear which his ancestor had carried in prehistoric times.

SEC. 416. *Athletic Games.*—In Greece athletic training had a prominence which it has never had elsewhere. It was a large part of the education of boys and young men, and occupied much of the time, attention, and ambition of the men who had reached mature years. Next to the agora, where the public markets and political assemblies of the sovereign people were held, the chief resorts for men were the gymnasiums and palestras.

Every city maintained at least one gymnasium and paid the gymnasiarch, or manager, who directed the exercises, gave instructions in the rules and tricks of the different contests, supervised the diet of athletes while in training, and had assistants to rub them after the bath, to anoint them, to plaster and bandage the scratches and wounds sometimes received, and to sell oil for anointing. Besides its gymnasium every city had its palestra, for athletic exercises; but in what respect the two institutions differed from each other is not satisfactorily explained. Some authors think the palestra was reserved for the use of professional or highly expert athletes; others, that it was for boys, or for certain kinds of exercises, and especially for wrestling and boxing. Education at the gymnasium was compulsory for the male citizen, entitled to a voice in the government. At the age of sixteen he must begin a course of training that would fit him for military service, which, for the healthy man, was an accompaniment of full citizenship.

Every year each city had at least two local festivals in which prizes were offered to athletes, and, as a general rule, the contest was open to all Greek citizens not stained by crime. For the purpose of attracting competitors from a distance and thus stimulating their athletes to do their best, considerable prizes of money were offered.

These local festivals outnumbered the days in the year, but many athletes made it their business to attend as many as possible of those festivals in which the largest prizes were offered; and thus spent much of their time, with great advantage to their purse and to their fame. Their highest activity was limited to periods that might range from five to fifteen years, and while it lasted they were the most widely known personages in the Hellenic world.

Of the national festivals of Greece, the most brilliant was the Panathenaic, which was held annually at the beginning of August, to celebrate the birth of Athena, the tutelary goddess of the city. It began with a day devoted to music, oratory, poetry, and other intellectual entertainments; it gave the succeeding day to various athletic exercises; then a day to races on horseback and in chariots; then a day to ecclesiastic ceremonies, including the Panathenaic procession, in which most of the free inhabitants participated, marching to the temple of Athena to pay homage to her; and the final day of five, to a boat race in the harbor. The procession on the fourth day, considered the most imposing show that could be witnessed in Hellas, started at sunrise. All the adult male citizens of the military age appeared as soldiers, the rich as cavalry, and the poor as heavy armed infantry. The old men, exempt by age from service in the army, wore dresses of crimson. The priests wore their sacerdotal garments. The victorious athletes had a special place and wore the insignia of their triumphs. The young men, not old enough to bear arms, were dressed in white. The matrons and maidens of citizen families were accompanied by alien women and slave women, who carried fruits, flowers, and vessels to be used

in the ecclesiastical ceremonies. A hundred oxen to be sacrificed to the goddess were led by aliens and slaves. Nominally the chief features of the festival were the sacrifice of the victims and the offering of a new peplum to the ancient wooden idol of Athena in the Erechtheum, but to the multitude the principal attraction was the procession in which the wealth, the taste, the valor, and the beauty of Athens were collected. To see these, a large concourse of visitors came from other states of Greece.

The gymnastic games and horse races were open on equal terms to the citizens of other Greek states and large money prizes were offered so as to attract the best gymnasts in every contest. In the literary entertainment, the Panathenaic festival was unsurpassed. It was here that Herodotus read part of his history of the triumph of the Hellens in the Persian war, and as the Athenians had achieved great glory and power in that contest, they were so delighted with the impressive narrative that they awarded to him a prize of \$10,000 in money.

Among the national festivals, the next in importance to the Panathenaic was that of Dyonisus, or Bacchus, at Athens, in April. This also lasted five days, of which three were given to theatrical entertainments. It was for these that the famous plays of *Æschylus*, *Sophocles*, *Euripides*, and other distinguished Athenian tragedians, were written. Every city had its annual festival; and in Attica every village had its minor Bacchic festival.

Besides the national games, there were four international or Panhellenic festivals, the Olympic, the Pythian, the Isthmian, and the Nemean. The Olympic games were held in the midsummer of every fourth year; and the period intervening between one Olympic festival and another was called an Olympiad, with its first, second,

third, and fourth years from midsummer to midsummer. In historical Greece, records were kept by the Olympiads, the first of which began in the midsummer of 776 b. c.

The Pythian festival, next in importance to the Olympic, was first held in the autumn of 582 b. c., near the middle of the Olympiad, and thereafter at intervals of four years, in the second year of each Olympiad. The Isthmian festival was held in the springs of the first and the fourth years of every Olympiad; and the Nemean in the autumns of the second and fourth years. Thus in the LXXth Olympiad, we would have first, in July 500 b. c. the Olympic festival; the Isthmian in May, and the Nemean in September 499 b. c.; the Pythian in September 498 b. c.; in 497 b. c. the Isthmian in May and the Nemean in September; and then in July 496 b. c., the eve of another Olympic, thus completing the round of six Panhellenic festivals in the one Olympiad of four years. In every calendar year, and in every Olympic year, there was at least one of these great festivals. The latest in its origin, the Nemean, began in 570 b. c.

The Olympic games were held at Olympia in the territory of Elea, near the western shore of the Peloponnesus; the Pythian at Delphi, north of the Corinthian gulf; the Isthmian near Corinth; and the Nemean about forty miles southwest from Corinth. At the Olympic festival, the entertainments were exclusively games of muscular training, including chariot races; at the Pythian, Isthmian and Nemean festivals, there were musical and literary contests in addition to the gymnastic exercises.

To these festivals people went in parties, wearing festival badges, which gave them a sacred character, and entitled them to pass in peace through states with which their own was at war, while returning from, as well as in

going to, the place of assemblage. For three centuries preceding 320 b. c., every Greek city, including those in Italy, Sicily, Gaul, Africa, and on the shores of the Black Sea, was represented by an embassy at every Olympic festival; and a failure to be so represented would have been considered a national disgrace. These embassies came in gorgeous attire, with numerous attendants, decorated chariots, splendid tents, and costly sacrificial implements; for every embassy must make a sacrifice in the name of its state. Each embassy from a leading city was accompanied by a multitude of private individuals. The places where the festivals were held had their chariot roads leading to all the adjacent cities and seaports. The exercises included wrestling, jumping, quoit-pitching, javelin-throwing, boxing and races afoot, on horseback, and in chariots. The foot races were the short, of four hundred yards; the double, of eight hundred; and the long, of sixteen hundred. From the remarks of various ancient authors about the Greek and Roman boxing matches, from the descriptions of the wrappings on the arms and hands while boxing, from the battered ears of the busts of boxers, and from the customs of the medieval and modern inhabitants of Greece and Italy, the inference is drawn that the system of boxing practised among the ancients was different from that of the modern English.² The blows seem to have been struck from the side rather than from the shoulder. The Spartans, who were fond of very rough sport, and who, in their wrestling matches, permitted biting and finger-breaking, and even eye-gouging, forbade boxing as the source of serious injuries and quarrels.

The number of visitors being large and their stay brief, they brought or hired tents, converting the site of the

festival into a transitory city bearing much resemblance in some of its features to the encampment of an army. Although the gymnastic exercises were considered the attraction, nevertheless, the commercial business of the gathering was, in some cases at least, the chief attraction for the majority of the attendants. Traders came from great distances with large stocks of merchandise, which were exposed for sale in booths; and the facilities for finding purchasers for elegant and costly wares at these gatherings were unequaled elsewhere in the Greek dominions.

Olympia was the only place where representatives of all the Hellenic cities came together at regular periods, and therefore public monuments were erected there with inscriptions recording the terms of treaties affecting rights of many states. Delphi, near the site of the Pythian festival and near the great temple where Apollo delivered his oracles, had similar monuments, but not so many as those at Olympia.

A list kept of the names of the winners of the first prize, in the short foot race, at Olympia, and of the cities which they represented, shows that, in the earlier centuries, most of the competitors came from the near vicinity, and that, in later times, there was an increasing proportion from distant cities. In the VIIIth century, from 776 to 700 b. c., Messenia won five triumphs, Elis three, Laconia, Corinth, and Megara each two, and Sicyon, Epidaurus, Coronea, and Dyme, each one. In the VIIth century, Laconia won fourteen, Athens five, Epidaurus two, and Thebes, Megara, and Hyperesia, each one. In the VIth century, Crotona won eight; Laconia four; Corcyra and Elis, each two; and Chalcis, Camarina, Thessaly, Tarentum, Himera, Pellene, Opus, Pharsalus,

and Peparethus, each one. Between 496 and 432 b. c., Himera and Crotona won each three; Syracuse (by an athlete trained in Crotona) two; and Thessaly, Corinth, Ambracea, Messalia, Cyrene, Mitylene, Argos and Pos-eidonia, each one. These numbers are here given for the purpose of showing how, in the beginning of the historical period of Greece, the winners, and presumably the competitors, were in large majority from the Pelopon-nesus, and from that portion of it near Olympia; and how, in later times, all the Hellenic communities participated in the triumphs.¹

Each site of a Panhellenic festival had an amphitheatrical ravine with seats for many thousands of spectators, the higher and remoter seats being so far off that the spectators there could neither see nor hear distinctly what was done or said in the arena. The seats were di-vided into sections, running from front to back; and each section was set apart for a city. . The ambassadors and certain honored personages, including winners at international or national games, occupied the front row or rows of seats, and the best places open to the com-mon people were usually taken before daybreak, and sometimes early on the previous evening. Slaves, aliens, and married women were not admitted to the amphitheater; maidens had a legal right to admission, but public opinion, save among the Spartans, forbade them to avail themselves of this privilege. There was no covering for the amphitheater; the heat was often great; the dust especially during the chariot races, was suffocating; and the long sitting was very tiresome. To many of the Greeks the attendance on the games was a great bore.

Every competitor was required to spend a month at the amphitheater in preparatory exercises. This training

and the festival were superintended by resident managers, whose duty it was to see that every part of the exhibition should be creditable to the occasion. When the day came and the spectators had taken their seats, the managers led the competitors round the amphitheater, while a herald proclaimed the nature of the contest, and the name and nationality of every participant, and also called upon anyone who had an objection to the admission of any of the proposed competitors, on account of slavery, crime, or barbarian blood, to state his case. If objection was made, and it rarely was, the managers listened to the accusation and decided it summarily.

Then the struggle began, and after a few minutes of intense exertion for the participants, and of intense excitement for the spectators, it was decided amidst great demonstrations of rejoicing among the compatriots of the winner, who was regarded as a man who had conferred high honor on his city. Crowned with a wreath of wild olive, the only material reward offered by the managers of the Olympic festival, he was led out into the arena, and his name and city were proclaimed by the herald, and greeted by the assemblage with loud applause. No matter how ignorant, how young, how rude in his manners, how unprepossessing in his appearance, how poor, or how obscure in his family, from that time forward he was a celebrated man. He was entitled to a brilliant reception in his native city. He returned at the head of its embassy. When he drew near, a multitude of his fellow-citizens went out to bid him welcome and to thank him for the honor he had conferred on them. Crowned with laurel, dressed in purple, in a chariot drawn by white horses, he re-entered his city, not through one of its gates, but through a wide breach in the wall

made by the city authorities. It was said that a city which had a victor at the Olympic games did not need walls. So long as he lived, he had the privilege of dining in a public hall at the city's expense.

The chief attraction at Olympia was the chariot race, which, as compared with the other contests, gave occupation to the largest number of people, made the greatest show, involved the most danger, and called out the longest list of men distinguished for wealth and political power. Among those who competed in the chariot race of Olympia at various times were such monarchs as Hiero of Syracuse, Jason of Pheræ, and Philip and Alexander of Macedon. This was the only contest in which wealth was necessary, and strength and dexterity were unnecessary for a triumph. The award was given to the owner of the horses, not to their driver. It was not necessary that the winner should be present in person at the games.

Although the Pythian, Isthmian, and Nemean games, on account of their musical, poetic, and elocutionary contests, were much more interesting to many Greeks than the Olympic festival, still the latter attracted a far larger number of attendants and competitors and a much more imposing display by national embassies. It also had greater social and commercial significance. Its precedence in time and its adoption by fashion gave it a pre-eminence which it never lost until long after Greece ceased to be free.

The general system of management was the same at all these Panhellenic festivals. The reward of the victor in the Pythian games was a wreath of laurel, in the Nemean of parsley, and in the Isthmian of pine.

Many athletes numbered their prizes by hundreds,

and Theagenes, of Thasos, was credited with winning fourteen hundred. We are told that he ate a whole ox at a single meal, and that in this feat he was equaled by Titornos, another famous gymnast.³ They say that Milo carried an ox four years old a distance of two hundred yards, with the implication that this animal was as large as the average Greek ox at that age; and that, standing between two oxen, he grasped a hind foot of one with his right hand, and a hind foot of the other with his left, and held them so firmly that neither could break loose from him. We read that after Argeus, of Argos, won a race at Olympia, he ran to carry the news of his triumph to his native city, and arrived there the same day, having made a journey equal to one of eighty miles on level road.

After the battle of Plataea, all the fires of the city were extinguished, for the reason that they had been desecrated by the Persians, and an order was issued that no new fire should be started from any source save a flame, or embers to be brought from the temple of Delphi. A Platæan athlete offered to bring the fire within a day, and he accomplished his feat, running sixty miles each way, but fell dead when he reached his home. He was buried in the temple of Plataea, and an inscription recorded his feat.⁴

The remarkable feats of noted athletes, however, do not furnish evidence of the benefits of gymnastic training so conclusive as do some of the marches of Greek armies. Thus the Spartan troops which arrived at Marathon after the battle, traveled one hundred and fifty miles on three consecutive days, a march for which no parallel is found in the history of modern warfare.

When they had outlived the period in which they

could hope to acquire an income from their prizes, many of the professional athletes obtained profitable employment as superintendents of gymnasiums, and in such positions commanded high salaries. When the skillful artisan could not earn more than \$75 a year, Demotedes, the athlete, received \$1,500 from Athens, and he was induced to go to Samos by an offer of \$2,200!

SEC. 417. *Greek Morality*.—Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus, and Zeno, who taught almost continuously from 425 till 275 b. c. (there was a brief interval between the flight of Aristotle and the opening of the school of Epicurus), were a series of ethical teachers unequaled in capacity in any other state; and in elevation of sentiment and purity of motive, their moral doctrines were not inferior to those of any equal number of men, who have been accepted as the highest authorities in any other nation. The first distinguished moral teacher of Athens, however, was not a philosopher, but a tragic dramatist by profession.

“No modern theology,” says Mahaffy, “has taught higher and purer moral notions than those of Æschylus and his school, developed afterwards by Socrates and Plato, but first attained by the genius of Æschylus. Thus he censures high-handedness even in the gods (Prometheus), so laying the foundations for that great doctrine of immutable morality, which is the pride of modern ethics. Again, he shows the indelible nature of sin, and how it recoils upon the third and fourth generation, thus anticipating one of the most marked features in Christian theology. Nay, even involuntary transgressions of the moral law are followed by dire consequences. The agreement of Sophocles (in his *OEdipus*) shows that these deep moral ideas were no individual

feature in *Æschylus*, and that there must have been a sober earnestness at Athens very far apart from the ribaldry of Aristophanes. Such immorality as that of the modern French stage was never tolerated among the Greeks, in spite of all their license."¹

Sophocles was often sublimely ethical. A prayer in one of his tragedies says: "Oh! that my lot may lead me in the path of holy innocence of word and deed; the path which august laws ordain, laws that in the highest empyrean had their birth, of which heaven is the father alone, neither did the race of mortal man beget them, nor shall oblivion ever put them to sleep. The power of God is mighty in them, and groweth not old."² Euripides followed his great predecessors in the dramatic art. He exulted that in Athens—

"The weak, the rich, have here one equal right,
And penury, with justice on its side,
Triumphs o'er riches; this is to be free.
Is there a mind that teems with noble thought
And useful to the state? He speaks his thought
And is illustrious. When a people, free,
Are sovereigns of their land, the state stands firm."³

Morality was not intimately associated with religion, or with certain phases of it, in the popular conception of the Greeks. Their myths attributed to their gods nearly every form of vice and crime, without giving offense to the pious multitude. Many of the divinities had characteristic specialties of wickedness. Theft was appropriate in the conduct of Hermes, cruelty in Mars, adultery in Jupiter; and many gods took pride in the success of their deceitful falsehoods. But the Greeks no more thought it justifiable to imitate such vicious

examples, than Christians would consider it proper to imitate the murder, adultery, treachery, perjury and gross cruelty of David.

Infanticide, which is criminal in all Christian nations, was lawful in ancient Hellas, which also tolerated some forms of vice rare now. On the other hand, their constitutional governments gave to the Greeks a sense of human dignity, and a regard for political rights, which have a large place in practical ethics, and which were unknown to contemporaneous Asiatic nations. "In no city of historical Greece did there prevail either human sacrifices or deliberate mutilation . . . or selling of children into slavery or polygamy, or the feeling of unlimited obedience to one man; all customs which might be pointed out as existing among contemporary Carthaginians, Egyptians," and Persians, and which were highly debasing in their influences.⁴

Athens contributed to the support of many women, children, and aged men deprived by war of those who would have furnished them with maintenance. The man who fell in her battle was buried by her with honor; his minor son received from her a full suit of armor, and his daughter a marriage portion. There were no hospitals for the poor and helpless, but the indigent could sleep in the club buildings, of which there were three hundred or more in Athens.

There were no charitable associations, but much was done in charity by individuals; and cases of great disaster called out marked demonstrations of public sympathy. The most notable of these occasions was the great earthquake at Rhodes. Hiero and Gelo, of Syracuse, sent \$95,000 in money to relieve the distress, and exempted the merchant vessels of the Rhodians from

import duties. The reigning Ptolemy of Egypt, a Greek in education and feeling, gave 250,000 bushels of grain, 10,000 pounds of bronze coin, and large quantities of timber and hemp. Antigonus, of Macedon, contributed \$100,000 in money, and great supplies of iron, timber, tar, and pitch. Seleucus gave ten quinqueremes completely equipped, besides grain and timber. Mithradates, Prusias, and other princes reigning on the southern shore of the Black sea, also contributed.

"That harmonious sustained manhood, without disproportion or anomaly or eccentricity, that godlike type in which the same divine energy seems to thrill with equal force through every faculty of mind and body,—the majesty of a single power never disarranging the balance, or impairing the symmetry of the whole,—was probably more keenly appreciated and more frequently exhibited in ancient Greece than in any succeeding civilization."⁶

SEC. 418. *Oration of Pericles*.—The most comprehensive statement of the main characteristics of the intellectual and social life of Athens, when in her most flourishing condition, is given in an oration delivered by Pericles, at the funeral of the Athenian soldiers who died at Samos. Of all the productions of oratory, this is the one that possesses the highest interest for intelligent men of all lands and times. Many other orations are more brilliant in style, but in wealth of thought and of emotion, nothing approaches it, save the brief speech by Lincoln, at Gettysburg. In comparison with these, the grandest flights of Demosthenes, Webster, and Gladstone are of local and temporary interest. The following is part of this oration as translated by Grote:—

"We live under a constitution such as noway to envy the laws of our neighbors,—ourselves an example to

others, rather than mere imitators. It is called a democracy, since its permanent aim tends towards the many and not towards the few; in regard to private matters and disputes, the laws deal equally with every man; while looking to public affairs and to claims of individual influence, every man's chance of advancement is determined, not by party favor, but by real worth, according as his reputation stands in his own particular department; nor does poverty, or obscure station, keep him back, if he really has the means of benefiting the city. And our social march is free, not merely in regard to public affairs, but also in regard to intolerance of each other's diversity of daily pursuits. For we are not angry with our neighbor for what he may do to please himself, nor do we ever put on those sour looks, which, though they do no positive damage, are not the less sure to offend. Thus conducting our private social intercourse with reciprocal indulgence, we are restrained from wrong in public matters by fear and reverence of our magistrates for the time being, and of our laws, especially such laws as are instituted for the protection of wrongful sufferers, and even such others as, though not written, are enforced by a common sense of shame. Besides this, we have provided for our minds numerous recreations from toil, partly by our customary solemnities of sacrifice and festival throughout the year, partly by the elegance of our private establishments, the daily charm of which banishes the sense of discomfort. From the magnitude of our city, the products of the whole earth are brought to us, so that our enjoyment of foreign luxuries is as much our own and assured as those which we grow at home. In respect to training for war, we differ from our opponents (the Lacedæmonians) on several material points. First,

we lay open our city as a common resort: we apply no xenelasy to exclude even an enemy either from any lesson or any spectacle, the full view of which he may think advantageous to him; for we trust less to manœuvres and quackery than to our native bravery, for warlike efficiency. Next, in regard to education, while the Lacedæmonians, even from their earliest youth, subject themselves to an irksome exercise for the attainment of courage, we, with our easy habits of life, are not less prepared than they, to encounter all perils within the measure of our strength. The proof of this is, that the Peloponnesian confederates do not attack us one by one, but with their whole united force; while we, when we attack them at home, overpower for the most part all of them who try to defend their own territory. None of our enemies has ever met and contended with our entire force; partly in consequence of our large navy, partly from our dispersion in different simultaneous land expeditions. But when they chance to be engaged with any part of it, if victorious, they pretend to have vanquished us all; if defeated, they pretend to have been vanquished by all.

“Now, if we are willing to brave danger, just as much under an indulgent system as under constant toil, and by spontaneous courage as much as under force of law, we are gainers in the end, by not vexing ourselves beforehand with sufferings to come, yet still appearing in the hour of trial not less daring than those who toil without ceasing.

“In other matters, too, as well as in these, our city deserves admiration. For we combine elegance of taste with simplicity of life, and we pursue knowledge without being enervated; we employ wealth, not for talking and ostentation, but as a real help in the proper season; nor

is it disgraceful to anyone who is poor to confess his poverty, though he may rather incur reproach for not actually keeping himself out of poverty. The magistrates who discharge public trusts fulfill their domestic duties also; the private citizen, while engaged in professional business, has competent knowledge of public affairs; for we stand alone in regarding the man who keeps aloof from these latter, not as harmless, but as useless. Moreover, we always hear and pronounce on public matters, when discussed by our leaders, or perhaps strike out for ourselves correct reasonings about them; far from accounting discussion an impediment to action, we complain only if we are not told what is to be done before it becomes our duty to do it. For, in truth, we combine in the most remarkable manner these two qualities, extreme boldness in execution, with full debate beforehand on that which we are going about; whereas with others, ignorance alone imparts boldness, debate introduces hesitation. Assuredly, those men are properly to be regarded as the stoutest of heart, who, knowing most precisely both the terrors of war and the sweets of peace, are still not the less willing to encounter peril.

“ In fine, I affirm that our city, considered as a whole, is the schoolmistress of Greece; while viewed individually, we enable the same man to furnish himself out and suffice to himself in the greatest variety of ways, and with the most complete grace and refinement. This is no empty boast of the moment, but genuine reality; and the power of the city acquired through the dispositions just indicated exists to prove it. Athens alone, of all cities, stands forth in actual trial greater than her reputation; her enemy, when he attacks her, will not have his pride wounded by suffering defeat from feeble hands,

—her subjects will not think themselves degraded as if their obedience were paid to an unworthy superior. Having thus put forward our power, not uncertified, but backed by the most evident proofs, we shall be admired not less by posterity than by our contemporaries. Nor do we stand in need either of Homer or of any other panegyrist, whose words may for the moment please, while the truth when known would confute their intended meaning: we have compelled all land and sea to become accessible to our courage, and have planted everywhere imperishable monuments of our kindness as well as of our hostility.

“ Such is the city on behalf of which these warriors have nobly died in battle, vindicating her just title to unimpaired rights, and on behalf of which all of us here left behind must willingly toil. It is for this reason that I have spoken at length concerning the city, at once to draw from it the lesson that the conflict is not for equal motives between us and enemies who possess nothing of the like excellence, and to demonstrate by proofs the truth of my encomium pronounced upon her.”¹

The report of this oration is not to be classed with the speeches of generals and envoys in Herodotus and Livy. Those speeches are statements of the causes of political action or of motives for military effort, and were written by men who had no opportunity to know what, if anything, was said on the occasion. This was the greatest of the orations of Pericles, who, in his time, was regarded as the greatest of orators. His reputation, the publication of the report among people who heard the oration, the position of Thucydides as a statesman responsible to public opinion, the offense that would be taken by an incorrect report, and the fact that the value

of this report depended upon its substantial accuracy, are guaranties that we have the ideas if not the words of Pericles.

SEC. 419. *Athenian Enjoyment*.—In the age of Pericles, the bright side of life in Athens was very bright. Every intelligent citizen was familiar, by sight at least, with Pericles, Cimon, Herodotus, Thucydides, Sophocles, Euripides, Socrates, Phidias, and Ictinus. He was brought into frequent association with them by his regular attendance and active participation in the prytane, the senate, the assembly, the army, and various executive offices. He was present in the theater at the first performance, of the greatest of the ancient tragedies. He saw the unveiling of the sculptures of Phidias. He assisted at the consecration of the Parthenon, the Erechtheum, the Propylea, and the great theater of Dionysus. His city was uncontestedly the home of the highest education, of the most polished society, of the most eminent oratorical, literary, architectural, plastic, and pictorial art, and of the most advanced form of constitutional freedom in the known world. The glories of the victories at Marathon, Salamis, Mycale, and Platæa were still fresh; and those who had participated in them were still numerous. Every day was full of excitement and wonder and just motives for national pride.

But the other side to this Athenian life was correspondingly dark. The power and wealth of Athens were insecure. Her territory might within a week's notice be ravaged by her rancorous enemies, the Spartans, who were distant only three days' march. Thebes and Corinth, still nearer neighbors, and both powerful, were also hostile. Whenever these three enemies should combine their forces and work together harmoniously, the future

of Athens would be almost hopeless. The anticipation of danger did much to spoil the flavor of present enjoyment.

While the foreign relations of Athens were always precarious, her internal condition was far from serene. Questions of domestic policy kept her people in turmoil. Contentions that filled all classes of citizens with anger were frequent. About once in seven years, on an average, one of the ablest statesmen was banished by ostracism. The more influential the person, the greater his danger. The penalties of public life were, in many cases, unavoidable. The office often sought the man and compelled him to accept it and its great dangers. The higher the office, the greater the peril. And even if only a private citizen, he must serve repeatedly in war, and fight against the Spartans and Thebans, whose armies were better drilled than those of Athens. A large proportion of his fellow-citizens died in battle, or in slavery that resulted from defeat in battle, and he must look to a similar fate as a near contingency. Many who escaped these risks, survived to share a national humiliation more bitter to them than death. The modern American or Englishman has no good cause to envy the ancient Athenian.

SEC. 420. *End of Ancient Greece.*—With the beginning of the Peloponnesian war Greece fell into a decline. The number of her freemen, their wealth, their commerce, and their manufacturing industry, diminished. Her statesmanship and her literature lost their brilliancy. Her foreign influence became insignificant. For two centuries after the accession of Alexander she was little more than a breeding-place for mercenary soldiers to be used in distant wars.

After they became subjects of Rome, there was a constant increase of barbarian blood among the Greeks. The Hellenic stock, diminished by destructive warfare and emigration, was mingled with that of colonists and liberated slaves of other nationalities. When Mithradates defied Rome, the Greeks gladly became his allies, and in his war, Athens lost a large proportion of her citizens, whose places were filled by Italians. After lying in ruins for a century, Corinth was rebuilt by a Roman colony. In the wars between Pompey and Cæsar, between the senate and the friends of Cæsar, and between Antony and Augustus, most of the Greek cities took sides with the parties which were ultimately defeated; thousands of Greeks were slain; and much of their country, into which they had brought the wars, was devastated. Many of the most prosperous Greeks were induced to leave their native land to become residents of Constantinople when it was raised to the dignity of an imperial city; and four centuries later there was a large migration, not without compulsion, to occupy places made vacant by a great pestilence.

In 395 A. D. and the following year, a Gothic army invaded Boeotia, Attica, and the Peloponnesus, occupied all their valleys and cities, slew most of their inhabitants, and carried away many as slaves. After the withdrawal of the Goths, much of the country was covered with brushwood and forest, which disappeared very slowly as population and cultivation again reclaimed the land. In the last half of the VIIIth century A. D., extensive hordes of barbarous Slavonians poured into all parts of Greece and made permanent homes there for themselves and their descendants. They entered as peaceful immigrants, but they carried arms, and a bitter national animosity

between them and the weaker Greeks, led to the expulsion or withdrawal of the latter from many of the valleys. The Slavonians gradually learned to speak Greek, and to forget the tongue of their ancestors, but they gave their own names to many of the mountains, brooks, valleys, and towns. They substituted Vrana for Marathon, Kokla for Platea, Kapurna for Chæroneia, Miraka for Olympia, Nikli for Tegea, Muchli for Mantinea, Slovochorion for Anyklæ, and Charbatı for Argotis.

In the XIVth century, the country was overrun by the Albanians, who became its masters and permanent occupants. They too adopted the Hellenic tongue. After its coasts had been repeatedly ravaged by the Saracens, Normans, and Venetians, Greece was conquered by the Turks, who held it for four centuries, slew and carried away many of its people, and introduced many slaves, who mixed with the common people. Whether any family in modern Greece has inherited most of its blood from the ancient Greeks, is extremely doubtful.

The circumstances of Greece since 300 A. D. have been so unfavorable to culture that a race as gifted as that of the Athenians in the age of Pericles, would have had great difficulty in making any notable achievement. The emperors in Constantinople hated the characteristic institutions and the influence of ancient Greece. In 394 A. D. they prohibited the Panhellenic games; in 529 they made it a crime to teach philosophy in Athens, and confiscated the endowments of the philosophic schools; and in the next year they forbade the teaching of Roman law in that city or anywhere in Greece. When the Goths and Slavonians drove out or destroyed most of the earlier inhabitants of Greece, the emperors made no efficient resistance while the wrong was being done, and inflicted

no punishment on the invaders afterwards. Those emperors who were strong were hostile to Greece; and those who were friendly to it, administered the government in such a way that all their subjects were oppressed and impoverished. The rule of the Turks maintained through four centuries was still worse and its influences have not yet disappeared.

Unfavorable industrial changes have accompanied or succeeded to political oppression. Greece is no longer the center of the highest commercial activity. In the age of Pericles, the greatest seaports were Athens, Corinth, and their surrounding cities of Byzantium, Samos, Miletus, Rhodes, Tyre, Sidon, Cyrene, Carthage, Syracuse, and Corcyra. Now not one of those places occupies a place among the great seaports, and most of them have fallen into insignificance. The greatest maritime cities of the present day are remote from the Mediterranean, in lands unknown to the ancient Greek. The shores of the Mediterranean have ceased to produce ship timber; and they have none of the coal which has become one of the chief sources of national wealth in our century. The improvements in house building, in lighting houses, in transportation by land and sea, in manufacturing iron, wood, and cotton, in establishing a high civilization among many millions of people in northern Europe, in America, Australia, and South Africa,—all these changes have contributed to transfer the bulk of the world's industry, wealth, enterprise, and intelligence from the shores of the Mediterranean to those of the Atlantic. In the age of Victoria, London holds a place similar to, but not so great intellectually as, that held by Athens in the time of Pericles.

The relative insignificance of the Greeks in modern

polity, literature, and ornamental and industrial art should be charged not to climatic disadvantages, nor to the exhaustion of national vitality, but to disadvantages of political condition, to inferiority of natural resources, and to lack of homogeneity in population. The summer of Greece is not more enervating now than it was when the physical energy of the Spartans and the intellectual activity of the Athenians reached the highest levels known in history. There is no proof of the theory that nations are subject to a law of growth, decay, and death, similar to that which governs the lives of individual plants and animals. Babylonia, Assyria, Lydia, and Phœnicia lived, flourished, and disappeared, but not one of them died a natural death. They perished not by internal exhaustion, but by external violence. As they were destroyed, so also was ancient Greece. Their histories furnish no materials from which we can calculate the decay of any great modern nation.

APPENDIX.

AT the end of this volume, a list of the books mentioned in it or considered worthy of the reader's special attention, is given. In the citations, abbreviations are used. Grote H. G. means Grote's History of Greece. Grote A. means Grote's Aristotle. The Bible is cited by book, chapter, and verse; other books by volume and page. The name of Aristotle is given in both the English and German form, because the Polity of Athens is known to me only in the German translation.

NOTES.

SEC. 305. *Palestine*.—¹The statement (1 Chron. xxi. 5) that under David, Palestine had 1,570,000 fighting men, deserves no credit.

SEC. 306. *The Jewish Bible*.—The critical theory, that Deuteronomy and Leviticus were written by different authors and in different centuries, and by men who lived more than six hundred years after Moses, is taught by Kuenen, Wellhausen, and the articles on Israel and the Pentateuch in the 9th edition of the "Encyclopedia Britannica." Books advocating this theory have been in print and have been recognized as high authorities for twenty years; and no distinguished orthodox scholar has published a reply to them. They are treated as if they could not be confuted.

The leading works of biblical criticism for the Old Testament are: "The Authenticity of the Hexateuch," by Kuenen; "The Prolegomena of the History of Israel," by J. Wellhausen, and the "Einleitung in das Alte Testament," by De Wette, as revised by Schrader, 8th edition. Those not familiar with the German will find much in Theodore Parker's translation of De Wette, but will not find the information brought up to the latest discoveries.

For the position of the Roman Catholic Church in reference to the latest results of biblical criticism, see articles by St. George Mivart, in the XIXth Century of July and December, 1887. Mivart

is a doctor of the church, and a noted biologist, the most distinguished among the now living zealous adherents of the Papacy. In his July article, he gave a summary of the recent discoveries in biblical criticism, and announced that his purpose, in publishing them, was to vindicate the liberty of research in the study of the Scripture, as in 1885, in the same periodical, he had vindicated a similar freedom in teaching evolution. In the article of December, 1887, he stated that an effort had been made, in the Vatican, to obtain a condemnation of his position in regard to biblical criticism, and that it failed. In other words, the Pope had decided that without violating their duties to their church, Roman Catholics could say that Deuteronomy and Leviticus were forgeries committed long after the exodus, attributed, for purposes of deception, to the pen of Moses; and that the stories of the creation, the garden of Eden, and the flood are myths of no value either in history or religion. So far as the public have means of information, the enemies of Mivart have made no attempt to secure his condemnation since 1887. The Roman doctorate has been conferred on Mivart.

SEC. 307. *Myth and Legend*.—¹Gen. vi. 9-13. ²Ib. vii. 19, 21.

³Num. i. 45, 46. ⁴Jud. xxi. 25.

SEC. 308. *Oscillating Piety*.—¹Jud. ii. 7, 13, 14; iii. 12, 15; iv. 1-3; vi. 1, 7; ix. 33; x. 6-16; xiii. 1; xx. 1, 26.

SEC. 310. *The Hebrew Monarchy*.—¹2 Sam. xxi. 8, 9.

SEC. 311. *Religious Condition*.—¹Records of the Past, 2nd Series, ii. 66. ²1 Chron. viii. 33; xiv. 7. ³1 Kings xi. 7, 8. ⁴Ib. vii. 29, 36, 44; vi. 26.

SEC. 312. *The Prophets*.—¹1 Chron. xxix. 29. ²2 Sam. ii. 4; v. 3. 19.

SEC. 313. *The Jewish Monarchy*.—¹1 Kings xiv. 25, 26.

SEC. 314. *The Temple, etc.*.—¹1 Kings viii. 14-63. ²2 Kings xxiii. 4. ³1 Kings xi. 6. ⁴2 Kings xviii. 4, 5. ⁵Ib. xxiii. 5-25. ⁶2 Chron. xx. 33. ⁷2 Kings xxiii. 11. ⁸Ib. xxii. 5, 7.

SEC. 315. *Hilkiah's Book*.—¹2 Chron. xiv. 14. ²2 Kings xxii. 16-20; xxiii. 2-25.

SEC. 316. *The Captivity*.—¹2 Kings xxiv. 14. ²Ib. xxv. 26.

SEC. 317. *Synagogue*.—¹Ps. lxxxiv. 8.

SEC. 318. *Predictions*.—¹Ezekiel xxxiv. 22-28.

SEC. 319. *The Return*.—¹Ezra viii. 12-26. ²1 Kings ii. 2-9. ³1 Chron. xxii. 7-19; xxviii. 6-10, 19, 20. ⁴A tradition mentioned in the Talmud, which is a very poor authority, says that Ezra col-

lected the Sacred Scriptures, and published them as part of his work in the reorganization of the Jewish Church.

SEC. 321. *Prophets*.—¹ 1 Sam. viii. 7. ² Ib. ii. 28-35. ³ 2 Chron. vi. 26-28. ⁴ 1 Sam. i. 29. ⁵ Ib. 3. ⁶ Ib. ix. 19. ⁷ Ib. 9. ⁸ Ib. xix. 20.

SEC. 322. *Levite Priests*.—¹ Deut. x. 8; xviii. 5. ² Ib. 6, 7. ³ Ib. xxi. 5. ⁴ Josh. xiii. 14, 23; xviii. 7.

SEC. 323. *Aaronite Priests*.—¹ Num. xviii. 3, 18-24. ² 1 Chron. xxiii. 13. ³ Josh. xxi. 4.

There is, perhaps, no better method of getting a clear idea of the contradictions between Deuteronomy and Leviticus in regard to the sacerdotal office, than by underlining in red every phrase in both books containing the words Levi, Aaron, Levites, priests, sons of Levi, sons of Aaron, Aaronites, and Aaron and his sons. After all these phrases have been distinctly marked, a brief examination of them will convince any impartial reader that the two books were written with different purposes and meanings. In no verse does the Deuteronomist recognize a superior right of one portion of the tribe of Levi to the priestly office; and in no verse does the author of Leviticus admit that any Levite not descended from Aaron, can be a priest.

SEC. 324. *The High Priest*.—¹ Lev. xxi. 10-14. ² Sam. xx. 25. 1 Kings iv. 4. ³ Ib. i. 27.

SEC. 327. *Many Altars*.—¹ Ex. xx. 24. ² Josh. viii. 30; xviii. i. ³ Jud. vi. 26, 27. ⁴ Ib. xiii. 1-24. ⁵ Ib. vi. 24; xxi. 4; xx. 14. ⁶ 1 Sam. vii. 17; xi. 15; xvi. 2. ⁷ Ib. xiv. 23-35. ⁸ 2 Sam. xxiv. 25. ⁹ 1 Kings xviii. 30, 36. ¹⁰ Ib. iii. 1-5.

SEC. 328. *An Exclusive Sanctuary*.—¹ Deut. xii. 10-14. ² Josh. xviii. 1.

SEC. 329. *Slaughter*.—¹ Deut. xii. 20-24. ² Lev. xvii. 3, 4. ³ Num. i. 46.

SEC. 330. *Sacrifices*.—¹ Mal. i. 8, 13, 18. ² Num. xxviii. 29. ³ W. R. Smith, R. S., 207. ⁴ Lev. vii. 23-27. ⁵ Ib. xvii. 11. ⁶ Ib. 6.

SEC. 331. *Sacrifice Denounced*.—¹ Jer. vii. 3-7, 22. ² Isa. i. 11-14. ³ Amos v. 21, 22. ⁴ Micah vi. 5-8. ⁵ Ps. i. 9-13. ⁶ F. W. Newman, A. M., 288. Acts xv. 10.

SEC. 332. *Festivals*.—¹ Deut. xv. 23-25. ² Ib. xvi. 16, 17. ³ Ex. xii. 7, 34. ⁴ 2 Sam. xxiv. 9. 1 Chron. xxi. 5. ⁵ Lev. xxiii. 27. ⁶ Ib. 36.

SEC. 333. *Sabbatical Years*.—¹ Lev. xxv. 1-22.

SEC. 334. *Sacerdotal Revenue*.—¹ Lev. xxvii. 30, 32. ² Num. xviii. 9-12. ³ Ib. 14-18. ⁴ Deut. xv. 19, 20.

SEC. 335. *Law School, etc*.—¹ Deut. xvii. 18, 19. ² Deut. xxx. 9-12, 25, 26. ³ 1 Kings viii. 5-9. ⁴ Josh. viii. 31, 32.

SEC. 336. *The Divine Name.*—¹ Ex. iii. 13-15. ²Ib. vi. 3.
³1 Chron. viii. 33, 34. ²Sam. iv. 4, 5; v. 16; xi. 21.

The word “Jehovah” is used only four times in the King James translation of the Bible,—in Ex. vi. 3; Ps. lxxxiii. 18; Isa. xii. 2; xxvi. 4. The substitution of the word “Lord” (in some editions printed in small capitals, LORD) in the English version, for Jehovah in the Hebrew, even in passages where the latter name is necessary to convey the force of the original, is one of the cases in which the translators have systematically misled their readers. We shall find another instance in the avoidance of the term Messiah, where it is applied to Saul, David, and an expected temporal king.

SEC. 337. *No Monoltheism.*—¹Gen. xxviii. 13. Lev. xx. 26.
 Deut. xiv. 2; xxvi. 19. ²Ib. x. 17. ²Chron. ii. 5. Ex. xviii. 11.
³Ib. xxiii. 10, 23. Jud. vi. 10. Ex. xii. 12. Num. xxi. 29. ⁴1 Kings ix. 3.

SEC. 338. *Henotheism.*—¹ Hittell ii. 171, 227.

SEC. 339. *Anthropomorphism.*—¹Gen. i. 26, 27. ²Ib. ii. 3. ³Ib. iii. 8, 9; iv. 6; vii. 1; xii. 1; xviii. 1; xx. 3; xxvi. 1; xxxii. 30.
⁴Deut. xxxiv. 10. Num. xiv. 14. Ex. xxxiii. 11, 13. ⁵Ib. xxiv. 9, 10. ⁶Ib. xxix. 45. ⁷Gen. xviii. 20-32. ⁸Num. xiv. 20. ⁹Ex. xxxiii. 7-14. Deut. ix. 14-28. ¹⁰Gen. vi. 6.

SEC. 340. *No Immortality.*—¹Gen. iii. 17, 22. ²Ib. xvii. 8; xv. 18.
³Ib. xxii. 17, 18. ⁴Ib. iv. 12. ⁵Ib. vi. 13. ⁶Ib. ix. 25. ⁷Deut. v. 33.
⁸Ex. xx. 12. ⁹Deut. xxviii. 11, 26. ¹⁰Ps. vi. 5. Eccl. iii. 19; iv. 5, 6, 10. Isa. xxxviii. 18. Job. xiv. 10, 12, 14. ¹¹2 Sam. i. 23; xii. 23. Ps. xxxiii. 19; xxxvii. 18. Job. xix. 25-27. Isa. lv. 3. Hosea xiii. 14. Amos. v. 8. On the other side are Ps. vi. 5; Job. xiv. 7, 10, 12, 14, 21; Eccl. iii. 19, 22; iv. 2; v. 12; viii. 15; ix. 5. ¹²Acts xxiii. 8. ¹³2 Tim. i. 10.

SEC. 341. *Jewish Morality.*—¹2 Sam. xxiiii. 1. ²1 Sam. xiii. 14.
³1 Kings xi. 33, 34; xv. 5. ⁴2 Sam. vii. 9-16. ⁵Ib. xxii. 25. ⁶Ib. xxii. 1-14. ⁷2 Sam. xxix. 1-25. ⁸1 Kings xi. 11-25. ⁹Micah vi. 8. ¹⁰Lev. xix. 18.

SEC. 342. *Woman's Wrongs.*—¹Gen. ii. 24. ²Deut. xxii. 15. ³Ib. xxiv. 1. ⁴Eccl. vii. 28.

SEC. 343. *Slavery.*—¹Lev. xxv. 44-46. ²Ex. xxi. 2. ³Ib. 26.
⁴Ib. 20, 21.

SEC. 344. *Hatred of Aliens.*—¹Deut. xx. 10-14. ²Ib. 16. ³Ib. viii. 16. ⁴Ib. vii. 2. ⁵Ib. xxiii. 30, 20; xv. 23. ⁶Ex. xii. 35, 36.
⁷Deut. xxiii. 36. ⁸Ex. xvii. 16. ⁹Deut. xxv. 17, 19.

SEC. 345. *Criminal Law.*—¹Ex. xxii. 24, 25. ²Lev. xxiv. 19.
³Num. xxxv. 19. ⁴Num. v. 11-28.

SEC. 346. *Ecclesiastical Crimes*.—¹ Ex. xxx. 33-38. Num. xv. 35; xviii. 7. Deut. xiii. 5. Lev. xx. 26. Deut. xvii. 12. Lev. xxiii. 28, 29; xvii. 4; xxiv. 16. Deut. xiii. 6. ² Ex. xxxii. 18. Lev. xx. 26. ³ Deut. xxviii. 16-28.

SEC. 347. *Malignant Prophets*.—¹ Ps. cix. 6-12. ² Ib. lxxxiii. 13-17. ³ Ib. lxxix. 6. ⁴ Jer. xviii. 21.

SEC. 348. *Originality*.—¹ Ex. xxxviii. 1-19. Wilkinson iii. 358. ² 1 Sam. xxiii. 9-13. Wilkinson iii. 308. ³ For the Egyptian story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, see Brugsch i. 308.

The Babylonians had a story of creation similar in many points to that of the Jews and much older in date. They had a watery chaos in the beginning; they had a light which preceded the creation of the firmament, after which came the celestial bodies, and then animals; and the woman was made from the man. The word for chaos is the same in both stories. (See Records of the Past, Second series, i. 130, 132.) Eden was evidently in the basin of the Euphrates. The four rivers were the Euphrates, Tigris, Pison, and Gihon. The word "Eden" is Babylonish, and means field or garden.

The story of the deluge was of Chaldean origin, and was copied by the Jews, with some modifications. George Smith, in his Chaldean Account of Genesis, shows the points of similarity. So also does Schrader in his Cuneiform Inscriptions. The latter says (i. 50): "The Chaldean story of the dispatch of the birds when the flood subsided, has unquestionably greater claims to originality than the scriptural account" Sayce O. G. R. 53-57.

The story of Moses in the bulrushes is copied from an Assyrian legend. (Smith. Chaldean Genesis, 299.)

A number of phrases in the Old Testament are copied from the Assyrian books. Schrader i. 125, 129, 141, 174.

In the Assyrian tongue, Sabattuv means a day of rest for the heart. Schrader i. 20.

In the Chaldean religion seven was a sacred number, that of the planets and great spirits. It is also sacred in the Pentateuch.

Moses was the name of an Assyrian god. Schrader i. 23.

David is the name of an Assyrian god. Records of the Past, Second series, ii. 66. Sayce O. G. R. 53-57.

Jahve and Jahu, the same as Jehovah, names of an Assyrian god. Schrader i. 23; ii. 3, 26.

Wilkinson (iii. 441) says the ecclesiastical rites of the Egyptians "bore a striking resemblance," in many respects, to those of the

Jews, and calls attention to some of these similarities. Circumcision, which had been established in the valley of the Nile at least as early as 3,000 b. c. (Wilkinson iii. 385; Gen. xvii. 10), was commanded to the Jews as if other nations had never known such a custom; and it was to be the proof that the person submitting to it had made a covenant with Jehovah, and had thus become entitled to the benefit of the promises made to Abraham.

Jehovah means "he who lives," and an Egyptian divinity had a name with a similar signification. Brugsch ii. 377.

The Jewish ark resembled some shrines of Egyptian idols in having the shape of a boat. (Wilkinson iii. 355.) The cherubs, human heads and busts, or bodies with outstretched wings, were used on Egyptian shrines to represent the goddess of Truth. (*Ib.* 358.) The shrines were carried in procession by the Egyptian and also by the Jewish priests. 1 Chron. xv. 2, 15. Wilkinson iii. 355.

The Egyptian and the Hebrew priests were anointed when installed in office. Wilkinson iii. 360, 363; Ex. xxviii. 41.

The Egyptian judge, while trying cases, wore on his breast a plate with the figures of Ra, the god of Light, and Ma, or Thmei (Themis), the goddess of Justice (Wilkinson iii. 183), and the Jewish High Priest, on official occasions, wore a breast piece called the Urim and Thummim, the signification of which was not explained, and had been forgotten. Ex. xxviii. 30.

All the oxen selected for sacrifice in Egypt were red (Wilkinson iii. 399); and in Judea a heifer sacrificed on certain occasions must be red. Num. xix. 2.

The custom of the scapegoat was common to the Egyptians and Jews. Lev. xiv. 21.

A sacred fire was kept burning continually in the temple of Thebes, as well as in that of Jerusalem. Lev. vi. 12, 13.

The Jewish law says that "he that uttereth the name of the Lord [Jehovah] shall surely be put to death" (Lev. xxiv. 16); and the Egyptians had a fear of speaking the name of Osiris, as many savages have of pronouncing the name of a dead chief or father.

In her Eastern Life (chap. v.), Harriet Martineau gives a list of many points in which the Pentateuch adopts the older ceremonial observances of the Egyptians.

The Elohistic and Jehovistic portions of the Pentateuch are arranged in parallel columns in De Wette in such a manner that they can be compared very conveniently. Among the parallel passages are these:—

Creation. Gen. i. 1-ii. 3 *vs.* Gen. ii. 4-iii. 24.
 Genealogy. Gen. v. 1-32 *vs.* Gen. iv. 1-26.
 Deluge. Gen. vi. 9-22 *vs.* Gen. vi. 1-8; vii. 1-5.
 Noah's Covenant. Gen. ix. 1-17 *vs.* Gen. viii. 20-22.
 Abraham's Covenant. Gen. xvii. *vs.* Gen. xv.
 Sodom. Gen. xix. 29 *vs.* Gen. xix. 1-28.
 Sarah's Seizure. Gen. xx. *vs.* Gen. xii. 10-19; xxvi. 1-11.
 Birth of Isaac. Gen. xxi. 1-21 *vs.* Gen. xvi.
 Abimelech. Gen. xxi. 22-34 *vs.* Gen. xxvi. 26-33.
 Abraham's Temptation. Gen. xxvi. 1-13 *vs.* Gen. xxii. 14-18.
 Jacob in Mesopotamia. Gen. xxvii. 46; xxviii. 9 *vs.* Gen. xxvii. 41-45.
 Quails. Ex. xvi. *vs.* Num. xi.
 Moses' Rock. Num. xx. 1-33 *vs.* Gen. xvii. 1-7.
 SEC. 349. *Historical Inaccuracy.*—¹ 1 Sam. xxiv. 1. ² 1 Chron. xxi. 1. ³ 1 Kings v. ii. ² Chron. ii. 10.
 SEC. 350. *Mosaic Authorship.*—¹ Ex. xxxii. 19. ² Ib. xxxiv. 1, 27, 28. ³ The place of worship. Ex. xx. 24; Deut. xii. Lev. xvii. The religious festivals. Ex. xxiii. 14-17; Deut. xvi. 1-17; Lev. xxiii. The priests. Ex. xxviii. Num. iii. Deut. xviii. The tithes. Num. xviii. 21-32. Lev. xxvii. 32, 33. Deut. xiv. 22-29; xxvi. 12-15. The firstlings. Ex. xxii. 29, 30; xiii. 12, 13; xxxiv. 19-20. Deut. xv. 19-23. Num. xviii. 15-18. The emancipation of slaves. Ex. xxi. 1-6. Deut. xv. 12-18. Lev. xxv. 39-43. These references are from Kuenen 25. ⁴ Deut. xxxi. 9. ⁵ Ib. ix. 12; x. 1.

The following are dates of some notable events in the history of the ancient Jews:—

- 1053-1013 B. C. Reign of David.
- 973. Division of Hebrew Monarchy.
- 621. Publication of Deuteronomy.
- 597. First deportation of Jews.
- 585. Second deportation and destruction of Jerusalem.
- 536. Return of Jews under Zerubbabel.
- 535. Foundation of second temple.
- 517. Completion of second temple.
- 459. Composition of Leviticus and publication of Pentateuch.
- 63. A. D. Jerusalem taken by Romans.

The dates of the creation, the flood, the migration into Egypt, and the exodus from Egypt can be calculated from the number of generations as given in the first chapter of Chronicles.

The periods of confusion which accompanied the overthrow of

the Jewish monarchy, and the re-establishment of a Jewish government in Jerusalem, were favorable to the establishment and amplification of an ecclesiastical system. In the thirteen years that Josiah reigned, after the publication of Deuteronomy, Hilkiah and his subordinate priests of Jehovah had exclusive control of the temple and public worship. All the heathen altars had been destroyed and all the heathen priests slain or driven into exile. Every year the principal men were brought together at Jerusalem and compelled to listen to the reading of a book which was called the sacred law of their ancestors. The result is a remarkable confirmation of the opinion of Plato in the following passage: "The lawgiver can obtain belief for any fiction which he pleases to circulate, as may be seen by the implicit belief obtained for the Theban myth about the dragon's teeth, and a thousand other myths equally difficult of credence. He must proclaim the doctrine as an imperative article of faith, carefully providing that it shall be perpetually recited by one and all his citizens in the public hymns, narratives, and discourses, without any voice being heard to call it in question." Grote P. iii. 333.

SEC. 352. *Hellas*.—The best history of Greece and the best of all national histories is, in my opinion, that of Grote. The histories of Greece, by Curtius and Thirlwall, are excellent.

The best descriptions of Greek life are given by Felton and Mahaffy; and further details can be found in Guhl and Koner, Becker, Stoll, Goell and St. John.

He who wishes to get a general idea of Greek poetry, should read Felton, Mahaffy, and Symonds.

The management of the theatrical stage is explained by Haigh and Moulton.

The merits of the Greek philosophers are well explained by Grote, Lewes, and Donaldson.

SEC. 356. *Greek Aristocracy*.—¹ Some historians, including Grote and Freeman, give the name of "oligarchy" to such governments as those of Sparta and Corinth. I call them "aristocracies."

SEC. 357. *Constitutionalism*.—¹ Grote H. G. iii. 17.

SEC. 358. *Small States*.—¹ Aristotle E. 294.

SEC. 362. *Spartan Army*.—¹ Grote H. G. ix. 352.

SEC. 364. *Helots*.—¹ Grote H. G. ii. 378.

SEC. 365. *Spartan Policy*.—¹ Macaulay v. 25.

SEC. 366. *Greek Despots*.—¹ Aristotle P. v. 4, 8; viii. 48. ² Grote H. G. iii. 20.

SEC. 367. *Theseus and Draco*.—¹ Freeman H. E. ii. 120.

SEC. 369. *Athenian Assembly*.—¹ Aristoteles 11.

SEC. 370. *Citizenship Dignified*.—¹ Grote H. G. iii. 137.

SEC. 371. *First Jury*.—¹ Grote H. G. v. 401. ²Ib. 389. ³Ib. 405.

SEC. 375. *Isagoras*.—¹ Grote H. G. iv. 175.

SEC. 376. *Persian War*.—¹ Thus Curtius (ii. 251) explains the ease of the victory and the silence of Herodotus about the Persian cavalry.

“This contest of the Greeks with Persia was the one supreme battle of history; and to the triumph of the Greeks, we owe what ever is most great and glorious in the subsequent achievements of the human race.” Symonds i. 33.

SEC. 377. *Platæa*.—¹ Herod. viii. 144. ²The Greek army at Platæa included 38,700 hoplites and 71,300 light armed men.

SEC. 378. *Aristides*.—¹ Aristoteles 68.

SEC. 379. *Pericles*.—¹ Aristoteles 38. ²Grote H. G. v. 364.

SEC. 380. *Political Education*.—¹ Aristoteles 68. ²Freeman F. G. 47. ³Grote H. G. iv. 177. ⁴Fiske 307. ⁵Freeman F. G. 40. ⁶Grote H. G. iv. 140. ⁷Ib. 154. This was written during the troubles that led to the Sonderbund civil war in Switzerland.

“This transient phase of Attic culture is unexampled in the history of the world for its clear and flawless character, its purity of intellectual type . . . and its plenitude of powers matured but unimpaired by use.” Symonds i. 439.

“If enlightening the people with regard to those things in which they are most concerned, ought to be the object of a political establishment, Athens was unquestionably the most enlightened city throughout the whole world. Neither Paris nor London, neither Rome nor Babylon, and still less Memphis, Jerusalem, Pekin or Benares, can enter into competition with it.” Herder 375.

“The incomparable intellectual qualities of the Athenians of that brief blossom-time, have so far dazzled modern critics that we have come to identify their spirit with the spirit of the Greek race.” Symonds i. 438.

Freeman (F. G. 88) calls Athens “that glorious vision of the world’s youth.”

SEC. 381. *Direct Democracy*.—¹ Grote H. G. iv. 178.

SEC. 383. *Drill and Sway*.—¹ Mahaffy O. G. E. 81. ²Grote H. G. v. 328. ³Curtius iv. 17. ⁴Freeman H. E. ii. 142.

SEC. 385. *Epaminondas*.—¹ This paragraph is a condensed paraphrase of a passage in Freeman H. E. ii. 144.

SEC. 386. *Timoleon*.—¹ Grote H. G. xi. 188. Grote's account of Timoleon's career is one of the most charming portions of his great book.

SEC. 388. *Alexander*.—¹ The reports that the catapult was invented by the Syrians, and the ballista by the Phœnicians (Dodge 161, 162) are probably without good foundation. A more credible rumor, current in antiquity, attributed these inventions to the army of Dionysius I., of Sicily. ² Dodge (137) says, "The Macedonian phalanx will always remain in history as the ideal of shock tactics;" and he might have added as one of the farthest from the ideal of a military body competent to defend itself against an unexpected attack in flank.

SEC. 389. *The Achæan League*. ¹ Freeman F. G. 287. ² *Ib.* 139.

SEC. 390. *Aratos*.—¹ Freeman F. G. 639. "The league had given to a larger portion of Greece, than any previous age had seen, a measure of freedom, unity, and general good government."—*Ib.* 109.

SEC. 391. *Bœolia, etc.*.—¹ Freeman F. G. i. 157.

SEC. 392. *Poetic Myths*.—¹ Muller D. i. 345. ² Gladstone 179. ³ Grote H. G. i. 357. ⁴ Cox H. G. ii. 125. Mahaffy (S. L. 345) considers it difficult to discuss seriously many of the theories of Cox stated in the Mythology of the Aryan Nations. The abuse of mythology is called "a disease of language." ⁵ Mahaffy S. L. 368.

SEC. 393. *Greek Worship*.—¹ Guhl 200. ² Felton i. 450. ³ Aristotle 3. ⁴ Coulanges 200.

SEC. 394. *Greek Monotheism*.—¹ Felton i. 457. ² Elton i. 253. ³ *Ib.* 379.

SEC. 395. *Delphi*.—¹ Grote H. G. ii. 254.

SEC. 396. *Various Responses*.—¹ Herod. iv. 97. ² *Ib.* 148. ³ *Ib.* i. 156. ⁴ Grote H. G. xi. 143. ⁵ Herod. i. 229.

SEC. 398. *Homer*.—¹ Paris 20. ² Grote H. G. ii. 206. ³ *Ib.* 117.

"The Greeks instinctively dropped the Eastern practice of writing from right to left," says Thirlwall (i. 107), and by so doing rendered a great service to education and literature.

SEC. 399. *The Greek Drama*.—¹ Grote H. G. viii. 322.

SEC. 400. *Socrates*.—¹ Grote P. i. 89. ² Jowett's Plato 343.

SEC. 401. *Socratic Philosophy*.—¹ Grote A. ii. 157. ² Grote H. G. viii. 424. ³ Grote P. i. 239. ⁴ Brocker, quoted in Grote P. i. 496. ⁵ Grote H. G. viii. 457. ⁶ Grote P. preface. ⁷ Grote H. G. viii. 345.

SEC. 402. *Plato*.—¹ Lewes A. 19. ² *Ib.* 90.

SEC. 403. *Aristotle*.—¹ Lewes A. 17. ¹Ib. 324, 330, 355. ³Ib. 99, 138. ⁴Ib. 179, 261, 281, 283, 306, 312, 317. ⁵Ib. 380.

SEC. 404. *Epicurus*.—¹ Grote A. ii. 437. ² Lewes B. H. P. 278. ³Grote A. ii. 438. ⁴Ib. ⁵Lewes B. H. P. 275. ⁶ Masson 63. ⁷Ib. 77. ⁸Ib. 8, 13, 176. ⁹Ib. 94. ¹⁰ Grote A. ii. 435. ¹¹ Masson 7, 189.

SEC. 405. *Stoicism*.—¹ Marcus Aurelius 210. ² Grote A. ii. 449. ³ Epictetus 385. ⁴Ib. 10. ⁵Ib. 72. ⁶Ib. 449. ⁷Ib. 392. ⁸ Lewes B. H. P. 183.

SEC. 406. *Greek Science*.—¹ Draper 142.

SEC. 408. *Greek Music*.—¹ Felton i. 139. ² Mahaffy Rambles, 443, 445. ³Ib. O. G. E. 72.

SEC. 409. *Greek Architecture, etc.*.—¹ Felton i. 298.

SEC. 412. *Greek Commerce*.—¹ For plans of Greek ships, see Guhl, 260.

SEC. 414. *Greek Children*.—¹ Grote P. iii. 232.

SEC. 416. *Athletic Games*.—¹ Muller's Dorians ii. ² Mahaffy O. G. E. 33. ³ Stoll 197. ⁴ Thirlwall i. 281.

SEC. 417. *Greek Morality*.—¹ Mahaffy S. L. 153. ² Sophocles in Symonds i. 448. ³ Euripides Suppliants, 399-464. ⁴ Grote H. G. ii. 256.

SEC. 418. *Oration of Pericles*.—¹ Grote H. G. vi. 144, 147.

LIST OF AUTHORITIES CITED IN THIS VOLUME.

Aristoteles, Staatswesen de Athener. Verdeutscht von G. Kaibel und A. Kiessling. Strassburg, 1891.

Aristotle, The Ethics, translated by E. D. Chase, London.

" The Politics, translated by E. Worlford, London, 1853.

Bible, the Holy. Authorized Version.

Brugsch, H., The History of Egypt, translated, 2 vols., London, 1881.

Coulanges, F. de, The Ancient City, translated by W. Small, Boston, 1874.

Cox, G. W. H., History of Greece, 2 vols., London, 1874.

Curtius, E., The History of Greece, translated by E. Ward, 4 vols., New York, 1871.

De Wette, W. M. L., Introduction to the Old Testament, translated by Theodore Parker, 2 vols., Boston, 1843.

Dodge, T. A., Alexander, Boston, 1890.

Donaldson, J. W., see K. O. Muller.

Draper, J. W., The Intellectual Development of Europe, New York, 1863.

Elton, C. A., Specimens of the Greek and Latin Poets, translated by, 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1854.

Epictetus, Discourses of, translated by G. Loud, London, 1877.

Felton, C. C., Greece, Ancient and Modern, 2 vols., Boston, 1867.

Finley, G., Greece under the Romans, London, 1857.

Fiske, John, The Unseen World, 7th edition, Boston, 1876.

Freeman, Edward A., Historical Essays, second series, London, 1873.

" " " History of Federal Government, London, 1803.

Gladstone, W. E., Juventus Mundi, London, 1869.

Goell, H., Kultur Bilder aus Hellas und Rom., 2 vols., Leipzig, 1880.

Grote, George, A History of Greece, 12 vols., New York, 1853.

" " Aristotle, 2 vols., London, 1872.

" " Plato, 3 vols., London, 1865.

Haigh, A. E., The Attic Theater, Oxford, 1889.

Herder, J. G., Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man, translated, London, 1800.

Herodotus, The History of, translated by G. Rawlinson, 4 vols., New York, 1882.

Heitzberg, G. F., Die Geschichte Griechenlands seit dem Absterben des Antiken Lebens, 3 vols., Gotha, 1876.

Hippocrates, The Genuine Works of, translated by F. Adams, 2 vols., New York, 1886.

Kuenen, A., The Authenticity of the Hexateuch, translated, London, 1886.

Lewes, G. H., Aristotle, London, 1864.

" " " The Biographical History of Philosophy, New York, 1879.

Lloyd, W. W., The Age of Pericles, 2 vols., London, 1875.

Macaulay, T. B., Miscellaneous Essays, 6 vols., New York, 1871.

Mahaffy, J. P., Greek Life and Thought, London, 1887.

" " " Old Greek Education, London, 1881.

" " " Old Greek Life, New York, 1879.

" " " Social Life in Greece, London, 1895.

" " " Rambles and Studies in Greece, London, 1878.

Martineau, Harriet, Eastern Life, Boston, 1876.

Masson, J., The Atomic Theory of Lucretius, London, 1884.

Muller, K. O., The History and Antiquities of the Doric Race, 2 vols., Oxford, 1830.

Muller, K. O., A History of the Literature of Ancient Greece,
continued by J. W. Donaldson, 3 vols., London, no date.

Moulton, R. G., The Ancient Classical Drama, Oxford, 1890.

Newman, F. W., A History of the Hebrew Monarchy, London,
1865.

Nineteenth Century, The.

Paris, P., Manual of Ancient Literature, translated, London, 1890.

Plato, The Dialogues of, translated by B. Jowett, 4 vols., Oxford,
1871.

Records of the Past, second series, edited by A. H. Sayce, London,
1888.

Sayce, A. H., Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion,
London, 1888.

Schrader, E., The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament,
translated by V. C. Whitehouse, 2 vols., London, 1885.

Smith, George, The Chaldean Account of Genesis, revised by A.
H. Sayce, New York, 1880.

“ “ “ Assyrian Discoveries, London, 1875.

Smith, W. Robertson, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church,
New York, 1881.

“ “ “ The Religion of the Semites, New York,
1889.

Stoll, H. W., Bilder aus dem Griechischen Leben, Leipzig, 1875.

Thirlwall, C., A History of Greece, 2 vols., New York, 1851.

Wellhausen, J., Prolegomena to the History of Israel, translated,
London, 1885.

Wilkinson, J. G., The Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyp-
tians, edited by L. Birch, 3 vols., London, 1878.

Young, R., Analytical Concordance to the Bible, New York, 1888.

END OF VOLUME III.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 547 151 1

